						ADDRESS OF A	admittenter setuentet Mittentet	THE STATE OF COMPAREMENTS			
				业	No.						The second second
	NAME OF COLUMN	المعجمة	Provensional							- Lorenteid	
	Contraction of the second seco			Anna Alberton Barranov Maria							
	A Mai			NAME OF CONTRACTOR	NEW DIAL OF CONTRACTOR						
						Mar 1		Parameters 			And Andrewson and Andrewson and Andrewson a
END DATE FILMED 7-79									4		



REPORT NO. FAA-ASP-78-7

X

8

MA069818

LEVEL

ESTABLISHMENT CRITERIA FOR DISTANCE MEASUREMENT EQUIPMENT (DME) WITH INSTRUMENT LANDING SYSTEM AND/OR LOCALIZER APPROACH AIDS

December 1978

DDC രിലവവം

JUN 13 1979

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A Approved for public release Distribution Unlimited

06 12 018



Prepared for:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION **Federal Aviation Administration** Office of Aviation System Plans Washington, D.C. 20591

To Report No.	2. Government Accession No.	3. Recipient's Catalog I	No.
FAA-ASP 78-7		(1)	
4. Title and Subtitle	Distance Messauring Equin	5. Report Date	1070 7
(DME) with Instrument Land	ing System and/or Localiz	zer 6 Parforming Organizati	Le Code
Approach Aids.		C. Fortening organizar	ion coue
7 Author(a)		8. Performing Organizat	on Report No.
H. L. Solomon, W. Heine, M	./Venturino	(12)68p.	
9. Performing Organization Name and Addr	ess	10. Work Unit No. TRA	15)
Systems Control, Inc. (Vt)	/		
Palo Alto, California 943	04	15 DOT-FA77WAI-731	WI-78-343
		13. Type of Report and I	eriod Covered
12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address		191-1-1	
Federal Aviation Administr	ation	Final kepo	rt.
800 Independence Avenue, S	W.	14. Sponsoring Agency C	ode
Washington, D.C. 20591		ASP-220, S.	Zaidman
15. Supplementary Notes			
16. Abstract		6	
(DWE) with sither I strong	ed establishment criteria	for Distance Measur	ing Equipm
I I I MULL WITH AITHAT INCTTIMO		I IOCALIZEL ADDIDACH	alus. In
criteria are based upon an	alvsis of DME payoffs ver	sus the cost of prov	iding and
criteria are based upon an maintaining the equipment.	alysis of DME payoffs ver This benefit/cost analy	sus the cost of prov	iding and
criteria are based upon and maintaining the equipment. factors:	alysis of DME payoffs ver This benefit/cost analy	sus the cost of prov vsis considers the fo	iding and llowing
criteria are based upon and maintaining the equipment. factors:	alysis of DME payoffs ver This benefit/cost analy	rsus the cost of prov rsis considers the fo	iding and llowing
criteria are based upon and maintaining the equipment. factors: Use of DME in lie	alysis of DME payoffs ver This benefit/cost analy eu of ILS outer marker be	rsus the cost of prov rsis considers the fo eacon;	iding and llowing
(DRE) with either instrumer criteria are based upon any maintaining the equipment. factors: Use of DME in lin Reduced probabili	alysis of DME payoffs ver This benefit/cost analy eu of ILS outer marker be ity of approach accidents	rsus the cost of prov rsis considers the fo eacon;	iding and llowing
(DME) with either instrument criteria are based upon and maintaining the equipment. factors: Use of DME in life Reduced probabil: Averted flight di	eu of ILS outer marker be ity of approach accidents isruptions due to reduced	sus the cost of prov vsis considers the fo eacon; i localizer minima;	iding and llowing
(DME) with either instrumer criteria are based upon any maintaining the equipment. factors: Use of DME in life Reduced probabili Averted flight di Averted missed ap Expedited aircrat	eu of ILS outer marker be ity of approach accidents isruptions due to reduced pproaches due to addition ft departures due to redu	rsus the cost of prov vsis considers the fo eacon; i i localizer minima; hal information provi uced departure flight	iding and llowing ded; path leng
(DME) with either instrumer criteria are based upon any maintaining the equipment. factors: Use of DME in line Reduced probability Averted flight di Averted missed ap Expedited aircrast	eu of ILS outer marker be ity of approach accidents isruptions due to reduced pproaches due to addition ft departures due to redu	rsus the cost of prov rsis considers the fo eacon; i localizer minima; nal information provi uced departure flight	iding and llowing ded; path leng
(DME) with either instrumer criteria are based upon any maintaining the equipment. factors: Use of DME in line Reduced probability Averted flight di Averted missed ap Expedited aircraft	eu of ILS outer marker be ity of approach accidents isruptions due to reduced pproaches due to addition ft departures due to redu ed on DME establishment f	sus the cost of prov rsis considers the fo eacon; i localizer minima; nal information provi need departure flight for purposes of traff	iding and llowing ded; path leng ic expedit
(DME) with either instrumer criteria are based upon any maintaining the equipment. factors: Use of DME in line Reduced probabil: Averted flight di Averted missed any Expedited aircrat Former criteria concentrate and approach minima reduct:	eu of ILS outer marker be ity of approach accidents isruptions due to reduced pproaches due to addition ft departures due to redu ed on DME establishment f ion. Revised criteria co	rsus the cost of prov rsis considers the fo eacon; i localizer minima; nal information provi nced departure flight for purposes of traff possider, in addition	iding and llowing ded; path leng ic expedit to the for
(DME) with either instrumer criteria are based upon an maintaining the equipment. factors: Use of DME in lic Reduced probabil: Averted flight di Averted missed ap Expedited aircrat Former criteria concentrate and approach minima reduct: going, DME as a safety aid	eu of ILS outer marker be ity of approach accidents isruptions due to reduced pproaches due to addition ft departures due to redu ed on DME establishment f ion. Revised criteria co	rsus the cost of prov vsis considers the fo eacon; i localizer minima; hal information provi uced departure flight for purposes of traff msider, in addition	iding and llowing ded; path leng ic expedit to the for
(DME) with either instrumer criteria are based upon any maintaining the equipment. factors: Use of DME in line Reduced probability Averted flight di Averted flight di Averted missed appendix and approach minima reduct: going, DME as a safety aid The revised criteria ident:	eu of ILS outer marker be ity of approach accidents isruptions due to reduced pproaches due to addition ft departures due to redu ed on DME establishment f ion. Revised criteria co	rsus the cost of prov vsis considers the fo eacon; i localizer minima; nal information provi aced departure flight for purposes of traff msider, in addition 55 localizer runways	iding and llowing ded; path leng ic expedit to the for for DME
(DME) with either instrumer criteria are based upon any maintaining the equipment. factors: Use of DME in line Reduced probabil: Averted flight di Averted flight di Averted missed any Expedited aircrait Former criteria concentrate and approach minima reduct: going, DME as a safety aid The revised criteria ident: establishment. At an avera	eu of ILS outer marker be ity of approach accidents isruptions due to reduced pproaches due to addition ft departures due to redu ed on DME establishment f ion. Revised criteria co fty 281 ILS runways and 3 age per-site equipment an	sus the cost of prov vsis considers the fo eacon; i localizer minima; al information provi uced departure flight for purposes of traff msider, in addition 5 localizer runways id installation cost	iding and llowing ded; path leng ic expedit to the for for DME of \$62,900
 (DME) with either instrumer criteria are based upon any maintaining the equipment. factors: Use of DME in line Reduced probability Averted flight di Averted flight di Averted missed appendix and approach minima reduct: going, DME as a safety aid The revised criteria ident: establishment. At an avera the potential program cost 	eu of ILS outer marker be ity of approach accidents isruptions due to reduced opproaches due to addition ft departures due to redu ed on DME establishment f ion. Revised criteria co isruptions due to redu ed on DME establishment f ion. Revised criteria co is approximately \$20 mil	sus the cost of prov vsis considers the fo eacon; i localizer minima; al information provi uced departure flight for purposes of traff posider, in addition 5 localizer runways d installation cost o lion.	iding and llowing ded; path leng ic expedit to the for for DME of \$62,900
(DME) with either instrumer criteria are based upon any maintaining the equipment. factors: Use of DME in line Reduced probabil: Averted flight di Averted flight di Averted missed ap Expedited aircras Former criteria concentrate and approach minima reduct: going, DME as a safety aid The revised criteria idents establishment. At an avera the potential program cost	eu of ILS outer marker be ity of approach accidents isruptions due to reduced pproaches due to addition ft departures due to redu ed on DME establishment f ion. Revised criteria co ify 281 ILS runways and 3 age per-site equipment an is approximately \$20 mil	rsus the cost of prov vsis considers the fo eacon; i localizer minima; hal information provi aced departure flight for purposes of traff msider, in addition 5 localizer runways id installation cost lion.	ded; path leng ic expedit to the for for DME of \$62,900
(DME) with either instrumer criteria are based upon any maintaining the equipment. factors: Use of DME in line Reduced probability Averted flight di Averted flight di Averted missed any Expedited aircraft Former criteria concentrate and approach minima reduct: going, DME as a safety aid The revised criteria ident: establishment. At an avera the potential program cost	eu of ILS outer marker be ity of approach accidents isruptions due to reduced pproaches due to addition ft departures due to redu ed on DME establishment f ion. Revised criteria co ify 281 ILS runways and 3 age per-site equipment an is approximately \$20 mil	rsus the cost of prov vsis considers the fo eacon; i localizer minima; al information provi iced departure flight for purposes of traff mosider, in addition 5 localizer runways d installation cost lion.	iding and llowing ded; path leng ic expedit to the for for DME of \$62,900
(DME) with either instrumer criteria are based upon any maintaining the equipment. factors: Use of DME in life Reduced probabil: Averted flight di Averted flight di Averted missed ap Expedited aircrait Former criteria concentrate and approach minima reduct: going, DME as a safety aid The revised criteria ident: establishment. At an avera the potential program cost	eu of ILS outer marker be ity of approach accidents isruptions due to reduced oproaches due to addition ft departures due to redu ed on DME establishment f ion. Revised criteria co ify 281 ILS runways and 3 age per-site equipment an is approximately \$20 mil	rsus the cost of prov vsis considers the fo eacon; i localizer minima; hal information provinced departure flight for purposes of traff posider, in addition 15 localizer runways d installation cost of lion.	iding and llowing ded; path leng ic expedit to the for for DME of \$62,900
 (DME) with either instrument criteria are based upon any maintaining the equipment. factors: Use of DME in lide Reduced probability Averted flight data Averted flight data Averted missed approach minima reduct: going, DME as a safety aid The revised criteria ident: establishment. At an avera the potential program cost 17. Key Words Distance Measurement Equipminstrument Landing System 	eu of ILS outer marker be ity of approach accidents isruptions due to reduced pproaches due to addition ft departures due to redu ed on DME establishment f ion. Revised criteria co ify 281 ILS runways and 3 age per-site equipment an is approximately \$20 mil Ment (DME) (ILS)	rsus the cost of prov vsis considers the fo eacon; i localizer minima; hal information provi uced departure flight for purposes of traff msider, in addition 05 localizer runways d installation cost of lion.	ded; path leng ic expedit to the for for DME of \$62,900 public
 (DME) with either instrument criteria are based upon any maintaining the equipment. factors: Use of DME in line Reduced probability Averted flight di Averted flight di Averted missed approach minima reduct: going, DME as a safety aid The revised criteria ident: establishment. At an avera the potential program cost 17. Key Words Distance Measurement Equipminstrument Landing System (Localizer (LOC) 	eu of ILS outer marker be ity of approach accidents isruptions due to reduced pproaches due to addition ft departures due to redu ed on DME establishment f ion. Revised criteria co Ify 281 ILS runways and 3 age per-site equipment an is approximately \$20 mil ment (DME) (ILS)	rsus the cost of prov vsis considers the for eacon; i localizer minima; hal information provi aced departure flight for purposes of traff msider, in addition 5 localizer runways id installation cost lion.	iding and llowing ded; path leng ic expedit to the for for DME of \$62,900 public
 (DME) with either instrumer criteria are based upon any maintaining the equipment. factors: Use of DME in line Reduced probability Averted flight di Averted flight di Averted missed any Expedited aircrait respective aircrait and approach minima reduct: going, DME as a safety aid The revised criteria ident: establishment. At an avera the potential program cost 17. Key Words Distance Measurement Equipm Instrument Landing System of Localizer (LOC) Establishment criteria 	eu of ILS outer marker be ity of approach accidents isruptions due to reduced pproaches due to addition ft departures due to redu ed on DME establishment f ion. Revised criteria co figure 281 ILS runways and 3 age per-site equipment an is approximately \$20 mil ment (DME) (ILS)	rsus the cost of prov vsis considers the for eacon; i localizer minima; al information provi aced departure flight for purposes of traff msider, in addition 55 localizer runways ad installation cost of lion.	iding and llowing ded; path leng ic expedit to the for for DME of \$62,900 public
 (DME) with either instrument criteria are based upon any maintaining the equipment. factors: Use of DME in lide Reduced probability Averted flight day Averted flight day Expedited aircrast Former criteria concentrate and approach minima reduct: going, DME as a safety aid The revised criteria ident: establishment. At an avera the potential program cost 17. Key Words Distance Measurement Equipm Instrument Landing System (Localizer (LOC) Establishment criteria 	eu of ILS outer marker be ity of approach accidents isruptions due to reduced pproaches due to addition ft departures due to redu ed on DME establishment f ion. Revised criteria co ify 281 ILS runways and 3 age per-site equipment an is approximately \$20 mil ment (DME) (ILS)	rsus the cost of prov vsis considers the for eacon; i localizer minima; hal information provinced departure flight for purposes of traff msider, in addition of localizer runways id installation cost of lion.	iding and llowing ded; path leng ic expedit to the for for DME of \$62,900 public
 (DME) with either instrumer criteria are based upon any maintaining the equipment. factors: Use of DME in line Reduced probability Averted flight di Averted flight di Averted missed appendiced aircrait Expedited aircrait Former criteria concentrate and approach minima reduct: going, DME as a safety aid The revised criteria ident: establishment. At an avera the potential program cost 17. Key Words Distance Measurement Equipm Instrument Landing System of Localizer (LOC) Establishment criteria 19. Security Clessif. (of this report) Unclassified 	alysis of DME payoffs ver This benefit/cost analy eu of ILS outer marker be ity of approach accidents isruptions due to reduced oproaches due to addition ft departures due to reduced oproaches due to addition ft departures due to reduced ed on DME establishment f ion. Revised criteria co lfy 281 ILS runways and 3 age per-site equipment an is approximately \$20 mil ment (DME) (ILS) 20. Security Classif. (of this page Unclassified	sus the cost of prov vsis considers the fo eacon; i localizer minima; hal information provi uced departure flight for purposes of traff msider, in addition 05 localizer runways id installation cost lion.	iding and llowing ded; path leng ic expedit to the for for DME of \$62,900 public 22. Price
 (DME) with either instrumer criteria are based upon any maintaining the equipment. factors: Use of DME in lie Reduced probabil: Averted flight di Averted flight di Averted missed ap Expedited aircrait rate and approach minima reduct: going, DME as a safety aid. The revised criteria ident: establishment. At an avera the potential program cost 17. Key Words Distance Measurement Equipm Instrument Landing System (Localizer (LOC) Establishment criteria 19. Security Clessif. (of this report) Unclassified 	alysis of DME payoffs ver This benefit/cost analy eu of ILS outer marker be ity of approach accidents isruptions due to reduced pproaches due to addition ft departures due to reduced ed on DME establishment f ion. Revised criteria co Ify 281 ILS runways and 3 age per-site equipment an is approximately \$20 mil ment (DME) Ils. Distribution Document Unclassified	rsus the cost of prov vsis considers the for eacon; i localizer minima; hal information provinced departure flight for purposes of traff onsider, in addition 15 localizer runways id installation cost lion. Storement is available to the 68	iding and llowing ded; path leng ic expedit to the for for DME of \$62,900 public 22. Price None
 (DME) with either instrument criteria are based upon any maintaining the equipment. factors: Use of DME in lide Reduced probabil: Averted flight data Averted flight data Averted missed approach minima reduct: going, DME as a safety aid. The revised criteria ident: establishment. At an avera the potential program cost 17. Key Words Distance Measurement Equipminstrument Landing System (Localizer (LOC)) Establishment criteria 19. Security Clessif. (of this report) Unclassified 	alysis of DME payoffs ver This benefit/cost analy eu of ILS outer marker be ity of approach accidents isruptions due to reduced oproaches due to addition ft departures due to reduced oproaches due to addition ft departures due to reduced of DME establishment f ion. Revised criteria co ify 281 ILS runways and 3 age per-site equipment an is approximately \$20 mil ment (DME) 18. Distribution Document Unclassified Reproduction of completed page on	rsus the cost of prov vsis considers the fo eacon; i localizer minima; hal information provi- inced departure flight for purposes of traff msider, in addition 05 localizer runways id installation cost of lion. Storement is available to the 0 21. No. of Pages 68 uthorized	iding and llowing ded; path leng ic expedit to the for for DME of \$62,900 public 22. Price None
(DME) with either instrumer criteria are based upon any maintaining the equipment. factors: Use of DME in life Reduced probability Averted flight di Averted flight di Averted missed ap Expedited aircrast Former criteria concentrate and approach minima reduct: going, DME as a safety aid The revised criteria idents establishment. At an avera the potential program cost 17. Key Words Distance Measurement Equipm Instrument Landing System of Localizer (LOC) Establishment criteria 19. Security Clessif. (of this report) Unclassified Form DOT F 1700.7 (8-72)	alysis of DME payoffs ver This benefit/cost analy eu of ILS outer marker be ity of approach accidents isruptions due to reduced oproaches due to addition ft departures due to reduced oproaches due to addition ft departures due to reduced ed on DME establishment f ion. Revised criteria co Ify 281 ILS runways and 3 age per-site equipment an is approximately \$20 mil ment (DME) Ile. Distribution Document Unclassified Reproduction of completed page on	rsus the cost of prov vsis considers the fo eacon; i localizer minima; hal information provinced departure flight for purposes of traff msider, in addition 05 localizer runways id installation cost lion. so Statement is available to the 68 uthorized	iding and llowing ded; path leng ic expedit to the for for DME of \$62,900 public 22. Price None

TABLE OF CONTENTS

0

0

0

														Page
	EXECU	TIVE SUM	MARY .				•				•			v
I	INTRO	DUCTION	AND PUR	POSE.										1
II	PREVI	OUS ILS	ESTABLI	SHMENT	CRI	TER	IA							2
	2.1	DME wit	h ILS.											2
III	REVIS	ED ESTAB	LISHMEN	T CRIT	ERIA	FO	RI	ME	W	HE	N			
	USED	WITH ILS	OR LOC	ALIZER	SYS	STEM	s.	•	•	•	•	•	•	3
	3.1	Candida	te Runw	ay Sel	ecti	on	Cri	te	ria	a				3
		3.1.1	DME in	Lieu	of a	in O	ute	r	Ma	rk	er			3
		3.1.2	Traffi	c-Rela	ted	Cri	ter	ia						3
		3.1.3	Benefi	t/Cost	Sci	een	ing	1 (Ph	as	e	II		
			Screen	ing).	• •	• •	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	4
	3.2	Candida	te Veri	ficati	on.		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	4
		3.2.1	Locali	zer (N	0 G1	ide	S1	.op	e)					
			Equipp	ed Run	ways									4
		3.2.2	Instru	ment L	andi	ng	Sys	te	m	(I	LS)		
			Equipp	ed Run	ways									8
	3.3	Regiona.	1 Data	Submis	sion	1								11
	3.4	Discont:	inuance	Crite	ria			-				-		11
	3.5	Example	of FAA	Regio	n (F	has	e 1	5	Car	nđ	iđ	at	-	
		Verific	ation C	omputa	tion	8							-	14
		3.5.1	Locali	zer (N	o Gl	ide	S1	in	•)	•	•	•	•	
			Equipp	od Dun	way	Fva	mpl	0	-,					14
		3 5 2	Instru	mont T.	andi	DAG	Cyc	+ 01	•	·	i c	;	•	74
		3.3.2	Equipp	ed Run	wav	Exa	mpl	A		(1.		1		16
			-1					-	•	•	•	•	•	
IV	TYPIC	AL SINGL	E DME C	OSTS.							•			19
v	DME-I	NDUCED BI	enefits						•		•	•	•	20
	5.1	DME Use	in Lie	u of a	n Ou	ter	Ма	rk	er.					22
	5.2	Improved	d Safet	y										24
	5.3	Reduced	Locali	zer Mi	nima									30
	5.4	Averted	Missed	Appro	ach						-		-	34
	5.5	Expedito	ed Dena	rture							-			38
		- Apeure	bepa.	un c	•••	• •	•	•	-	•	•	•	•	50

i



Availend/or special

Dist

...

Availability

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

Page

COMP	JTATION OF DME BENEFIT/COST CRITERIA
7.1	Example of DME in Lieu of Outer Marker
	Benefit Computation
7.2	Example of Safety Benefit Computation
7.3	Example of Reduced Localizer Minima
	Benefit Computation
7.4	Example of DME with Localizer Averted
	Missed Approach Benefit
7.5	Example of Expedited Departure Benefit
	Computation
7.6	Benefit/Cost Ratio
	7.6.1 Without Using DME in Lieu of an
	Outer Marker
	7.6.2 When DME Is Used in Lieu of an
	Outer Marker with an ILS.

ii

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

0

 \bigcirc

Figure		Page
5.1	Reduced Localizer Minima (Minima/Weather Interaction)	34
5.2	Regions of Reduced Localizer Minima and Averted Missed Approach Benefits	35
5.3	Probability of Averted Missed Approach Due to DME Opportunity	36
7.1	Example of the Use of Weather Weighting Factors Visibility Range (nmi)	53
7.2	Example of the Use of Representative Ceiling (feet)/Visibility (nmi) Value Factors	54
7.3	Probability of Averted Missed Approach Due to DME Opportunity	56

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
3.1	Nominal Distribution of Airport Traffic (AIA's) Among Available Instrumented Runways.	5
3.2	Qualifying AIA's at Localizer Runways	7
3.3	Qualifying AIA's at ILS-Equipped Runways	10
3.4	DME with ILS or Localizer Establishment Criteria Data Requirements	12
5.1	Candidate DME-Induced Benefits	21
5.2	Avionics Mix Factor Percent of IFR (Localizer + ILS w/wo DME) Equipped Fleet Function of Available Approach Aid and User Group	23
5.3	Avionics Mix Factor Adjustor	24

iii

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

Table		Page
5.4	DME-Induced Accident Rate Reductions (ARR) (per Million AIA's)	26
5.5	Net Discount Factors for Benefit Estimation .	27
5.6	Landing Accident Cost (\$000)	28
5.7	Air Carrier Accident Costs and Benefits by Hub Size	29
5.8	Accident Cost by User Category	31
5.9	Number of Injuries per Landing Aircraft by Generic Aircraft Type	32
5.10	Benefit per Annual Averted Flight Disruption.	33
5.11	Average Benefit of an Averted Missed Approach	38
5.12	Expedited Departure Benefits	39
6.1	DME Criteria Assessment	40
7.1	DME at ILS Safety Benefit Factors	46
7.2	Percentage Distributions of Weather Observa- tions Equal to or Less Than Selected Ceilings and/or Visibilities (National Average)	49

Service 1

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report develops revised establishment criteria for single distance measuring equipment (DME) use with either instrument landing system (ILS) or localizer approach aids.

These criteria are based on a benefit/cost analysis that considers the following factors:

1. Use of DME in lieu of an outer marker when the siting of an outer marker is not feasible;

 Reduced probability of approach accidents on localizer and/or ILS-equipped runways;

3. Averted flight disruptions due to reduced localizer minima;

4. Averted missed approaches due to additional information provided the pilot;

5. Expedited departures due to reduced departure flight path length.

Candidate pre-screening criteria were also developed for FAA Region use, based on AIA's. Benefit/cost criteria and an associated computer program, incorporating those criteria, were developed for FAA Headquarters use in screening those candidate runways for DME establishment identified by the regions.

The revised criteria identify up to 281 ILS runways and 35 localizer-only runways for DME establishment. At an average per-site equipment and installation cost of \$62,900, the potential total program cost is approximately \$20 million.

I. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

Criteria for the establishment of terminal air navigation facilities and air traffic control services provided by the FAA are published in Airway Planning Standard Number One (APS-1) (Reference 1). These criteria are published to foster the planned development of a safe and efficient National Airspace System while at the same time guiding the allocation of resources for facilities and services.

The purpose of this report is to develop revised establishment criteria for distance measuring equipment (DME) when used as an approach aid in combination with either an instrument landing system (ILS) or a localizer (LOC) system. The new criteria are based on an analysis of the costs and benefits of DME's expressed in terms of annual instrument approaches (AIA) on the candidate runway.

According to APS-1, an airport is a candidate for the establishment of a facility or service when it meets the specified criteria and it is economically justified by a benefit/cost analysis. Recognizing the burden that would be placed on field facilities by requiring detailed benefit/ cost analyses of potential candidates and their objections to such a procedure, DME establishment criteria based on typical or normalized costs will be used by regional personnel to identify potential DME candidates during preliminary budget formulation. Candidates thus identified will be screened and ranked by benefit/cost analysis in FAA Headquarters, using supporting data furnished by the regions and their responses to the annual Call for Estimates. Regional offices will have the option of using benefit/cost analyses to identify potential DME candidates.

1

marker beacon for transition to the TLE

II. PREVIOUS ILS ESTABLISHMENT CRITERIA

2.1 DME with ILS

Previous criteria for DME, as published in APS-1, were:

(a) A DME (single equipment) may be installed with an ILS in lieu of a marker beacon at locations where the geographical or operational environment is such that no final approach fix can be economically sited or transition to the ILS cannot be made using adjacent navigation aids, and procedures and operations will be simplified.

(b) An ILS airport recording 1,400 or more annual instrument approaches is a candidate for a DME facility when:

 (1) Lower landing minima will be authorized in accordance with applicable agency instrument approach criteria; and

(2) A climatology study indicates that the DME will provide a significant reduction in the number of missed approaches, cancellations, or diversions; or

(3) The DME will expedite the flow of IFR air traffic arriving and departing the airport.

(c) ILS airports with between 700 and 1,399 annual instrument approaches may be considered for a DME facility when an individual location study indicates that the DME will result in a number of additional completed approaches that is commensurate with the cost of the facility.

(d) <u>Discontinuance</u>. Except where used in lieu of a marker beacon, a DME facility at an ILS with approach lights serving an airport recording less than 400 annual instrument approaches is a candidate for decommissioning.

I/ FAA Order 8260.19, "Flight Procedures and Airspace," par. 741d(3), states that DME will not be used as the sole means for identifying fixes or establishing transitions. When DME is the only means, specialists are instructed to program an outer compass locator or limit use of the ILS to DME-equipped aircraft only. Revised criteria, therefore, no longer allow DME establishment in lieu of a marker beacon for transition to the ILS.

III. REVISED ESTABLISHMENT CRITERIA FOR DME WHEN USED WITH ILS OR LOCALIZER SYSTEMS

The benefits provided by a DME depend on a number of factors--the feasibility of installing an outer marker with qualified ILS's; the reduction of minimums attributable to DME when used with localizer, including the localizer component of ILS; the distribution of IFR weather conditions at the airport; traffic levels (AIA's) on the proposed DME runway by user category (air carrier, air taxi, general aviation, and military); and hub size. A DME may qualify for establishment solely on the basis of its use in lieu of an outer marker with a qualified ILS. This establishment cri-terion is directly dependent on the difficulty, as measured by cost, of installing and maintaining the outer marker. The runway activity level, by user group, directly influences the magnitude of the DME-induced benefit and acts as a multiplier on the single event benefits which are, in turn, related to reduced minimums, local IFR weather characteristics, and average reduction in departure flight path distance, if applicable. All of these variables are utilized by FAA Headquarters in screening those runways that are candidates for DME establishment as identified by FAA regional offices. A subset of these variables is required by the FAA regions to identify acceptable candidate runways for DME establishment, in accordance with the procedure described below.

3.1 Candidate Runway Selection Criteria

A runway where DME may be used with ILS in lieu of an outer marker as described in Section 3.1.1, or which meets the annual instrument approach criteria of Section 3.1.2, is a candidate for DME establishment.

3.1.1 DME in Lieu of an Outer Marker

A runway is a candidate for DME implementation with an ILS when the prevailing geographical or operational environment is such that no final approach fix can be economically sited.

3.1.2 Traffic-Related Criteria

A runway is a candidate for DME establishment when the annual instrument approaches recorded for that runway meet or exceed any combination of conditions presented in Section 3.2.

3.1.3 Benefit/Cost Screening (Phase II Screening)

ILS and/or localizer runways identified by the FAA regions (Phase I screening), using the procedures described in Section 3.2 as candidates for DME establishment, will be assessed in FAA Headquarters (Phase II screening) using the benefit/cost technique described in this report. FAA regional offices shall submit data required for Phase II screening purposes (See Section 3.3) with their responses to the annual Call for Estimates.

3.2 Candidate Verification

The procedures for use by the FAA regions in screening potential candidate runways for DME establishment are described in paragraphs 3.2.1 and 3.2.2 for localizer and ILS (including localizer) equipped runways, respectively.

3.2.1 Localizer (No Glide Slope) Equipped Runways

To determine whether a localizer equipped runway is a candidate for DME establishment:

(a) Compute the number of AIA's on the candidate runway for each user category as follows:

(1) Determine the AIA's by an on-site survey; or

(2) Calculate the AIA's by estimating the percentage of total airport AIA's that occurred on the candidate runway. Table 3.1 may be used for this purpose.

(b) Determine the lowest approach minima for the largest category of aircraft (i.e., Approach Category A, B, C, or D) consistently using the runway.

(c) Estimate, using TERPS criteria (Reference 2), the least approach minimums that will be authorized for localizer/ DME approaches on the candidate runway, for the aircraft category determined in (b).

(d) Determine hub size of candidate airport. Hub designations may be determined by computing the percent of annual national enplanements at the airport. TABLE 3.1

 \bigcirc

Nominal Distribution of Airport Traffic (AIA's) Among Available Instrumented Runways

Number of Instrumented Runways	Pri	oriti	(Per	listril rcent	Airpo	i fron ort Ti	n Busie affic	st (on D	1) to esign	Leas	tt Bus Runwa	sy (N) ay)	Runw	ay
Available at Airport	1	2	3	4	5	9	7	80	6	10	11	12	13	14
1	100													
2	70	30												
3	60	28	12											
4	50	25	15	10										
5	40	23	15	12	10									
9	30	20	15	15	10	10								
7	30	20	15	12	10	80	5							
8	30	20	15	10	10	5	5	2						
6	28	17	15	10	10	2	5	2	5					
10	25	15	15	10	10	S	5	2	2	5				
11	23	15	10	10	10	2	5	2	5	5	5			
12	20	15	10	10	10	5	5	2	2	5	5	5		
13	20	15	10	10	7	2	2	2	2	2	5	5	ß	
14	18	14	10	10	2	2	5	2	2	2	2	5	ю	e
Reference: Expande	ed from	data	obta	ined 1	from F	AA AS	sP-220.							

5

Stratter and

Percent of Total Annual National Enplanements	
at the Candidate Airport*	Hub Size
1.00	Large
0.25 to 0.99	Medium
0.05 to 0.24	Small
Less than 0.05	Non

at

(e) Determine qualifying AIA's. From Table 3.2, determine the qualifying AIA's for each user category (air carrier, air taxi, general aviation, and military) using the localizer and localizer/DME minima developed in steps (b) and (c), respectively. When these minima do not coincide with those values listed in Table 3.2, round off to the nearest Table 3.2 value. (Minima that lie half way between the ceiling and/or visibility values of Table 3.2 should be rounded off to the lower Table 3.2 value.)

If the minima values determined in steps (b) or (c) exceed the limits of Table 3.2 by more than 100 feet and/or 1/2 nautical mile, alternate criteria will be provided by the Office of Aviation System Plans.

(f) Determine the acceptability of the localizer runway as a candidate for DME establishment. Enter the recorded and qualifying AIA's for the selected runway as indicated below. The contribution of each user category toward satisfying the candidate runway acceptability criteria is determined by sum-mation. A localizer runway with a total of 1.0 or greater meets the AIA criteria and is a candidate for DME establishment.

* Current value of annual national enplanements may be obtained from the Office of Aviation System Plans.

TABLE 3.2

 \bigcirc

0

Qualifying AIA's at Localizer Runways

User	Hub						Locali	ser Minima					
Group	Size	400 1/2	400 1	500 1/2	500 1	600 1/2	600 1	600 1-1/2	700 1/2	700 1	700 1-1/4	700 1-1/2	700-2
LOC/DME Min =	300 1/2	.0											
AC	Large	67	34	30	21	18	14	10	11	10	8	7	5
AC	Medium	92	95	41	29	24	19	14	15	13	12	10	1
AC	Small	116	58	51	36	30	24	18	19	17	15	13	6
AC	Non	156	78	69	48	41	33	24	26	22	20	17	12
AT	IIA	1,105	554	488	342	289	232	168	186	158	139	123	87
CA/M11	IIV	5,845	2,931	2,580	1,812	1,527	1,227	888	983	838	736	652	460
LOC/DME Min =	300 1			398 0 0	0.0				2.2.6.3		27		
AC	Large		81		34		20	13		12	10	6	9
AC	Medium	(6)	111		95		27	18		17	14	12	80
AC	Small		139		58		34	22		21	18	16	11
AC	Non	10	188		61		45	30		28	24	21	14
AT	IIN		1,327		556		322	215		201	172	150	101
CA/M11	IIN		7,020		2,940		1,702	1,137		1,062	116	193	537
LOC/DME Min =	400 1/2	100		be to the	tod od	1							
AC	Large	2	11	56	32	25	19	13	14	12	10	6	9
AC	Medium		86	11	44	34	26	17	20	16	14	12	8
AC	Small	-	123	96	55	43	32	22	25	20	18	15	10
AC	Non		166	130	74	58	44	30	33	28	24	21	14
AT	11A	-	1,171	921	525	413	310	209	236	196	168	147	100
CA/M11	IIA	100	6,197	4,874	2,775	2,185	1,642	1,107	1,250	1,035	168	111	528
LOC/DME Min =	400 1	in the second				e de la					saiv		
AC	Large				61		27	16		15	13	11	1
AC	Medium				83		37	22		21	17	15	10
AC	Smal1	1			104		95	28		26	22	18	12
AC	Non	3			141		63	38		35	29	25	16
AT	IIA				866		445	269		248	207	177	115
CA/MIT	ALL				5,281		2,352	1,421		1,310	1,096	936	609

min tout

ŝ

NOTE: Localizer minima are celling and prevailing visibility associated with the Height Above Touchdown (HAT).

. .

Air Carrier:	AIA's on Runway Qualifying AIA's	-	x.xx
Air Taxi:	AIA's on Runway Qualifying AIA's	-	x.xx
General Aviation:	AIA's on Runway Qualifying AIA's	-	x.xx
Military:	AIA's on Runway Qualifying AIA's	-	x.xx
	Total (Estimated Benefit/Cost Ratio)	-	x.xx

User Category

3.2.2 Instrument Landing System (ILS) Equipped Runways

Steps (a) through (d) are identical to steps (a) through (d) of Section 3.2.1 but are repeated in this section to provide a totally self-contained description of the DME candidate verification procedure.

To determine whether an ILS-equipped runway is a candidate for DME establishment:

(a) Compute the number of AIA's on the candidate runway for each user category as follows:

(1) Determine the AIA's by an on-site survey; or

(2) Calculate the AIA's by estimating the percentage of total airport AIA's that used the candidate runway. Table 3.1 may be used for this purpose.

(b) Determine the lowest approach minima for the largest category of aircraft (i.e., Approach Category A, B, C, or D) consistently using the runway.

(c) Estimate, using TERPS criteria (Reference 2), the least approach minimums that will be authorized for localizer/ DME approaches on the candidate runway, for the aircraft category determined in (b).

(d) Determine hub size of candidate airport. Hub designations may be determined by computing the percent of annual national enplanements at the airport. Percent of Total Annual National Enplanements <u>at the Candidate Airport*</u> 1.00 Large 0.25 to 0.99 Medium 0.05 to 0.24 Less than 0.05 Non

(e) Determine qualifying AIA's. From Table 3.3, determine the qualifying AIA's for each user category (air carrier, air taxi, general aviation, and military) using the localizer and localizer/DME minima developed in steps (b) and (c), respectively. When these minima do not coincide with those values listed in Table 3.3, round off to the nearest Table 3.3 value. (Minima that lie half way between the ceiling and/or visibility values of Table 3.3 should be rounded off to the lower Table 3.3 value.)

If the minima values determined in steps (b) or (c) exceed the limits of Table 3.3 by more than 100 feet and/or 1/2 nautical mile, alternate criteria will be provided by the Office of Aviation System Plans.

(f) Determine the acceptability of the selected ILS runway as a candidate for DME establishment. Enter the recorded and qualifying AIA's for the selected runway as indicated below. The contribution of each user category toward satisfying the candidate runway acceptability criteria is determined by summation. An ILS runway with a total of 1.0 or greater meets the traffic level (AIA's) criteria and is a candidate for DME establishment.

*Current value of annual national enplanements may be obtained from the Office of Aviation System Plans.

TABLE 3.3

Qualifying AIA's at ILS-Equipped Runways

14

にあい

A AL

User	Hub				11		Locali	izer Minima	10				
Group	Size	400 1/2	400 1	500 1/2	500 1	600 1/2	600 1	600 1-1/2	700 1/2	700 1	700 1-1/4	700 1-1/2	700 2
LOC/DME Min = 300	0 1/2				106	100				- 00	1.2 m		
AC	Large	190	190	190	190	190	190	190	190	190	190	190	190
AC	Medium	260	260	260	260	260	260	260	260	260	260	260	260
AC	Small	326	326	326	326	326	326	326	326	326	326	326	326
AC	Non	442	442	442	442	442	442	442	442	442	442	442	442
AT	IIV	7,126	5,055	4,684	3,718	3,292	2,794	2,160	2,347	2,059	1,846	1,665	1,224
GA/Mil	IIV	17,110	806'6	8,889	6,514	5,580	4,561	3, 368	3,709	3,189	2,817	2,510	1,790
LOC/DME Min = 300	0 1				0.9								
AC	Large		190		190		190	190		190	190	190	190
AC	Medium		260		260		260	260		260	260	260	260
AC	Small		326		326		326	326		326	326	326	326
AC	Non		442		442		442	442		442	442	442	442
AT	A11		7,655		5,065		3,559	2,634		2,495	2,205	1,966	1,404
GA/M11	114		19,496		9,935		6,158	4,249	14 14	3,985	3,450	3,024	2,078
LOC/DME Min = 40	0 1/2			a y a y a y a y	900 995					80.			
AC	Large	190	190	190	190	190	190	190	190	190	190	190	190
AC	Medium	260	260	260	260	260	260	260	260	260	260	260	260
AC	Small	326	326	326	326	326	326	326	326	326	326	326	326
AC	Non	442	442	442	442	442	442	442	442	442	442	442	442
AT GA/M11	WI W	12,118	7,297	6,586 14,935	4,896	4,217	3,468	2,580 4,146	2,835 4,641	2,445 3,892	2,165	1,932 2,966	1,384 2,047
LOC/DME Min = 40	0 1											0770 043	
AC	Large		190		190		190	190		190	190	190	190
AC	Medium		260		260		260	260		260	260	260	260
AC	Small		326		326		326	326		326	326	326	326
AC	Non		442		442		442	442		442	442	442	442
AT	IIV		12,118		6,826		4,421	3,122		2,937	2,559	2,255	1,568
CA/M11	III		63,599		15,870		8,204	5,223		4,846	4,107	3,541	2,348

NOTE: Localizer minima are ceiling and prevailing visibility associated with the Height Above Touchdown (HAT).

 \bigcirc

....

10

and a

- Arman

User Category

Air Carrier:	AIA's on Runway Qualifying AIA's	•	x.xx
Air Taxi:	AIA's on Runway Qualifying AIA's	-	x.xx
General Aviation:	AIA's on Runway Qualifying AIA's	-	x.xx
Military:	AlA's on Runway Qualifying AIA's	-	x.xx
	Total (Estimated Benefit/Cost Ratio)	-	x . xx

3.3 Regional Data Submission

For those runways which qualify as candidates for DME establishment under Section 3.1 (DME in lieu of outer marker) or 3.2, the FAA regional office shall complete and submit the required data form (Table 3.4) in response to the Annual Call for Estimates.

3.4 Discontinuance Criteria

When the DME is used in lieu of an outer marker with an ILS, the criteria of Section 3.4.1 shall apply. For all other cases, the criteria of Section 3.4.2 shall apply.

3.4.1 When the DME is used in lieu of an outer marker with an ILS, it shall not be decommissioned. If the ILS is decommissioned, then the DME shall also be discontinued unless it is to be retained as part of a straight-in nonprecision approach facility.

3.4.2 A DME is a candidate for discontinuance when the total (estimated benefit/cost ratio) of Section 3.2.1 or 3.2.2 for localizer or ILS runways, respectively, becomes less than 0.6 (which is the ratio of 15-year present value annual DME O&M costs to 15-year present value total DME costs--see Section IV).

TABLE 3.4

DME with ILS or Localizer Establishment Criteria Data Requirements

Check largest aircraft	ft category that uses this	runway:	
Aircraft Categor	ry A 🔲		
Aircraft Categor	ry B		
Aircraft Categor	ry C		
Aircraft Categor	ry D		
Localizer and Localiz Above:	zer/DME Minima Associated	with Aircraft Cates	gory Checked
LOCALIZER AP	PROACH	LOCALIZER/DME	APPROACH
Ceiling	ft	Ceiling	ft
Visibility	nmi	Visibility	nmi
Weather Condition (Op	ptional)*		Z TOTAL OBSERVATIONS
(A) (1500 and/o	or 3) > $C/V \ge 400/1$		
(B) (400 and/o:	r 1) > C/V > 200 1/2		Landipha
(C) (200 and/or	$r 1/2$ > $C/V \ge 100 1/2.$.		
(D) (100 and/or	r 1/4) > C/V		· American La
Runway AIA's (by Use	r Group)		AIA's
General Aviation	n		isse date
Air Taxi			
Air Carrier			inu deenede
Military			·
Hub Size (Large, Med	ium, Small, or Non)		Hush the I
Average Averted Miss 40.05 nmi unless ove	ed Approach Go-Around Dist rridden by regional input)	ance in nmi (nomin (by User Group) GO	ally set at -AROUND DISTANCI
General Aviation	m		. nm:
Air Taxi			nmi
Air Carrier			nmi
Military			. nmi

*National average weather may be used in lieu of airport-specific weather data if this information is not supplied.

TABLE 3.4

(Continued)

Candidate Carification

DME Cost Estimates									
Equipment (Nom	inal Value \$	48,400).						\$	
Installation (Nominal Valu	e \$14,500)					\$	
Annual O&M (No	minal Value	\$13,721)						\$	
NOTE: No by	minal values regional in	are used put.	unless	overri	dden				
The following infor expedite departures	mation is ne	eded when	the pro	posed	DME :	s ex	pecte	ed to	
Estimated DME-Induc Departure (by User	ed Reduction Group)	in Depar	ture Fli	ght Pa	th Di	stan	ce -	Average	per
General Aviati	on								nm
Air Taxi									nm
Air Carrier									nm
Military									
OR								167.11	
Estimated DME-Induc Departure (by User	ed Reduction Group)	in Depar	ture Fli	ght Ti	me -	Aver	age p	ber	
General Aviati	on							1997.3	hr
								leres!	hr
Air laxi									
Air Taxi Air Carrier								and a state	hr
Air Taxi Air Carrier Military	· · · · · · · ·	· · · · · · · · ·	· · · · ·	· · · · · ·	 	•••	:		hr hr
Air Taxi Air Carrier Military The following infor in lieu of an outer	mation is ne marker:	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	the pro	 posed	DME i	s to	be u	used wit	hr hr
Air Taxi Air Carrier Military The following infor in lieu of an outer ILS 15-Year Discoun	mation is nemarker:	eded when	the pro	 posed er Bea	DME i	s to	be u	used wit	hr hr
Air Taxi Air Carrier Military The following infor in lieu of an outer ILS 15-Year Discoun Cost (from ASP-220)	mation is ne marker: ted Cost Exc	eded when	the pro	 posed er Bea	DME i	 s to	be u	sed wit	hr hr
Air Taxi Air Carrier Military The following infor in lieu of an outer ILS 15-Year Discoun Cost (from ASP-220) Outer Marker Beacon alternative, see di	mation is nemarker: ted Cost Exc 	eded when luding Ou counted C DME in li	the pro ter Mark	or sed er Bea or SP- ter ma	con 220. rker	s to For		sed wit	hr hr
Air Taxi Air Carrier Military The following infor in lieu of an outer ILS 15-Year Discoun Cost (from ASP-220) Outer Marker Beacon alternative, see di example computation	mation is new marker: ted Cost Exc. 15-Year Dis scussion on	eded when luding Ou counted C DME in li	the pro ter Mark ost (fro eu of ou	posed er Bea m ASP- ter ma	CON i	s to For		sed wit	hr hr
Air Taxi Air Carrier Military The following infor in lieu of an outer ILS 15-Year Discoun Cost (from ASP-220) Outer Marker Beacon alternative, see di example computation ILS 15-Year Discoun	mation is new marker: ted Cost Exc 15-Year Dis scussion on)	eded when luding Ou counted C DME in li by User C	the pro ter Mark ost (fro eu of ou 	posed er Bea ter ma (from	CON 220. rker	s to For 		sed wit	hr hr
Air Taxi Air Carrier Military The following infor in lieu of an outer ILS 15-Year Discoun Cost (from ASP-220) Outer Marker Beacon alternative, see di example computation ILS 15-Year Discoun Air Carrier	mation is nemation is nemation is nematical cost Exc.	eded when luding Ou counted C DME in li by User C	the pro ter Mark ost (fro eu of ou ategory 	 posed er Bea m ASP- ter ma (from 	CON 220. rker	 For 20):	be u	sed wit	hr hr
Air Taxi Air Carrier Military The following infor in lieu of an outer ILS 15-Year Discoun Cost (from ASP-220) Outer Marker Beacon alternative, see di example computation ILS 15-Year Discoun Air Carrier Air Taxi	mation is nemarker: ted Cost Exc 15-Year Dis scussion on 	eded when luding Ou counted C DME in li by User C	the pro ter Mark ost (fro eu of ou ategory 	or Bea or Bea or Bea or ASP- ter ma or or (from or or o	con 220. rker	 s to For 220): 	be u	sed wit	hr hr
Air Taxi Air Carrier Military The following infor in lieu of an outer ILS 15-Year Discoun Cost (from ASP-220) Outer Marker Beacon alternative, see di example computation ILS 15-Year Discoun Air Carrier Air Taxi General Aviati	mation is nemarker: ted Cost Exc 15-Year Dissecussion on ted Benefit 	eded when luding Ou counted C DME in li by User C 	the pro ter Mark ost (fro eu of ou ategory	 posed er Bea m ASP- ter ma (from 	DME 1 con 220. rker	 s to For 220):	be t	sed wit <u>\$</u> <u>\$</u> <u>\$</u> <u>\$</u> <u>\$</u> <u>\$</u>	hr hr

13

に

3.5 Example of FAA Region (Phase I) Candidate Verification Computations

Runway 24 at Palomar Airport, Carlsbad, California, and Runway 07 at Herndon Airport, Orlando, Florida, were selected to illustrate the DME establishment candidate verification procedures for localizer and ILS-equipped runways, respectively. The steps identified in Sections 3.5.1 and 3.5.2 correspond exactly to the steps described in Sections 3.2.1 and 3.2.2, respectively.

3.5.1 Localizer (No Glide Slope) Equipped Runway Example

Runway 24, Palomar Airport, Carlsbad, California

(a) Determine runway AIA's by user category. All airport AIA's occur on the single IFR runway resulting in the following:

User Category	Runway AIA's
Air Carrier	11
Air Taxi	30
General Aviation	2,530
Military	37

(b) Determine published minimums for localizer approaches for the largest aircraft category consistently using the runway:

		Localizer A	pproach Minima
Aircraft Category	Associated User Category	Ceiling (feet)	Visibility (nmi)
D	Air Carrier	737	2

(c) Estimate approach minimums that will be authorized for localizer/DME approaches on the candidate runway for the chosen aircraft category: (d) Establish airport hub size.

Since Palomar has less than 0.05 percent of the total annual national deplanements, it is classified as a non-hub airport.

(e) From Table 3.2 determine the qualifying AIA's for each user category.

Localizer Ceiling/ Localizer/DME Ceiling/ Visibility Minima Visibility Minima					
User Category	From Step B	Adjusted for Table 3.2 Compatibility	From Step C	Adjusted for Table 3.2 Compatibility	Qualifying AIA's
Air Carrier Non-Hub	737 2	700 2	400 3/4	400 1/2	14
Air Taxi				5	100
General Aviation	28			nittelsk	528
Military	-	•	+	+	528

(f) Verify validity of runway candidacy. Use recorded AIA's from Step (a) and qualifying AIA's from Step (e).

User Category	Recorded AIA's		Qualifying <u>AIA's</u>
Air Carrier	11		14
Air Taxi	30		100
General Aviation	2,530		528
Military	37		528
Air Carrier:	$\frac{11}{14}$	coacha orys	.79
Air Taxi:	<u>30</u> 100	-	.30
General Aviation:	$\frac{2,530}{528}$	nt genal (200 xe	4.79
Military:	<u>37</u> 528		.07
Total	Ratio Value	-	5.95

15

 \bigcirc

Since the approximated benefit/cost ratio is equal to or greater than 1.0, i.e., 5.95, Runway 24 at Palomar Airport would be considered as a valid candidate for DME establishment.

3.5.2 Instrument Landing System (ILS) Equipped Runway Example

Runway 07, Herndon Airport, Orlando, Florida

(a) Determine runway AIA's by user category. Runway 07 was ranked first in traffic of the four instrumented runways at Herndon. From Table 3.1, it is estimated that Runway 07 receives 50 percent of Herndon's AIA's resulting in the following traffic levels by user category.

Runway AIA's
1
19
882
32

(b) Determine the published minimums for localizer (not ILS) approaches on the candidate runway, for the largest aircraft category consistently using the runway.

		Localizer A	pproach Minima
Aircraft	Associated	Ceiling	Visibility
Category	User Category	(feet)	(nmi)
C	Air Taxi	491	1/2

(c) Estimate approach minimums that will be authorized for localizer/DME approaches on the candidate runway, for the chosen aircraft category:

		Localizer A	pproach Minima
Aircraft Category	Associated User Category	Ceiling (feet)	Visibility (NMI)
c	Air Taxi	300	1/2

(d) Establish airport hub size.

Since Herndon has less than 0.05 percent of the total annual national enplanements, it is classified as a non-hub airport.

(e) From Table 3.3 determine the qualifying AIA's for each user category.

	Localizer Ceiling/ Visibility Minima		Localiz Visib		
Usar	From	Adjusted	From	Adjusted	Qualifates
Category	B	Compatibility	C	Compatibility	AIA's
Air Carrier Non-Hub	t	t *	t	t	442
Air Taxi	491 1/2	500 1/2	300 1/2	300 1/2	4,684
General Aviation			1		8,889
Military	+	+	+	ł	8,889

(f) Verify validity of runway candidacy.

Use recorded and qualifying AIA's, by user category from Steps (a) and (e), respectively.

Air Carrier:	$\frac{1}{442}$	-	.0023
Air Taxi:	$\frac{19}{4,684}$	-	.0041
General Aviation:	<u>882</u> 8,889	-	.0992
Military:	$\frac{32}{8,889}$	-	.0036
	Total Ratio Value	-	.1092

Since the approximated benefit/cost ratio is less than 1.0, i.e., 0.1092, Runway 07 at Herndon Airport would not be considered as a valid candidate for DME establishment.



IV. TYPICAL SINGLE DME COSTS

Typical implementation and annual recurring costs (in 1977 dollars) for single unit distance measuring equipment are listed below. Also shown is the resulting 15-year discounted (10 percent) present value. Equipment costs include electronic equipment and freight. Installation costs include all other elements required to bring the DME up to an operational state, such as engineering, construction, electronic installation, and initial flight inspection.

		15-Year	
	station for	Discounted	Present
	Cost	Present Value	Value
	(1977 \$)	Factor	(1977 \$)
Investment ^(a)			
Equipment	\$ 48,400		
Installation	14,500		
Total Investment	\$ 62,900	1.0	\$ 62,900
Annual O&M ^(b)	\$ 13,721	7.605	\$104,348
Total 15-Year Cost	\$268,715		
Total 15-Year Discount	ted		
Present Value			\$167,248

All benefit/cost analyses described in this document utilize a 15-year discounted present value DME cost equal to \$167,248.

Source: (a) AAF-130 (b) AAF-250

V. DME-INDUCED BENEFITS

Based on a review of previously-used DME establishment criteria obtained from Airway Planning Standard Number One and the FY 1977 Call for Estimates, IFR-rated pilot interviews and discussions with FAA personnel both at Headquarters and in the regions, a list of candidate benefits was established. These benefits were divided into four categories to assist in assessing the desirability of incorporation into the DME establishment criteria. These DME benefit categories are: (1) those resulting from a reduction of the published ceiling and visibility approach minima; (2) those resulting from providing the pilot additional information but not affecting the published ceiling and visibility approach minima; (3) those made possible by additional operating flexibility; and (4) improved safety in the form of reduced approach accident rates.

Candidate benefits were developed in each category, recognizing that those benefits which reduced approach minimums would be relatively easy to quantify. Conversely, those DME benefits derived from providing the pilot additional information would be most difficult to quantify, somewhat subjective, and therefore possibly difficult to defend (particularly if they were a major contributor to the establishment criteria).

The initial list of candidate benefits, shown in Table 5.1, were screened with respect to potential benefit contribution, applicability to most runways, and the feasibility of developing acceptable quantification procedures.

With the concurrence of ASP-220, the following benefit categories were selected for inclusion in the DME establishment criteria:

- . DME in lieu of an outer marker
- improved safety
- . reduced localizer minima
- . averted missed approach
- . expedited departure

The following sections describe the approach developed to quantify each of these five benefits.

•

1-100

 \bigcirc

Candidate DME-Induced Benefits

	Reduction in Published	Additional Pilot	Additional Operating	
Application	Minima	Information	Flexibility	Improved Safety
	. DME Use in Lieu	. Averted Missed	. Expedited	. Reduced Approach
	of an Outer Marker*	Approach*	Departures*	Accident Rates*
			. Facilitate Noise	
DME USE WITH ILS	. Missed Approach Guidance Capability		Abatement . Procedures	
			. Improved ATC Traffic	
			Management	00 100 113 113 113 113 113
			. Improved Approach Reliability	, the r bas haics der m colat the the dut
	. Reduced Localizer	. Averted Missed	. Expedited	. Reduced Approach
	Minima*	Approach*	Departures*	Accident Rates*
DME USE WITH LOCALIZER			. Facilitate Noise Abatement Procedures	
LOCALIZER PORTION OF ILS			. Improved ATC Traffic Management	
			. Improved Approach Reliability	eal topo topo topo topo topo topo

21

...

- Andrews

5.1 DME Use in Lieu of an Outer Marker

In this application, the DME substitutes for the otherwise required outer marker beacon component of the ILS. This occurs when it is not technically and/or economically feasible to site and operate an outer marker. Thus, the benefits are based on the benefits associated with the establishment of an ILS on that runway. This potential ILS benefit must, however, be reduced to account for the fact that not all ILS-equipped aircraft are also equipped with DME; thus, only a subset of ILS aircraft can utilize this type of approach facility.

The method to quantify the 15-year discounted benefit/ cost ratio involves combining the individual ILS and DME benefits/costs into a single ILS + DME benefit/cost as shown below:

 $\sum_{\text{User}} (\text{ILS Benefit x AMFA + DME Benefit})$ $(\text{ILS + DME}) 15 \text{ Yr B/C} = \frac{\text{Group}}{(\text{ILS - Outer Marker Cost}) + DME \text{ Cost}}$

where:

- . All costs and benefits are 15-year discounted costs.
- . All ILS benefits and costs are obtained from ASP-220 based on ILS establishment criteria (Reference 4).
- . AMFA (avionics mix factor adjustor) listed in Table 5.3 is the ratio of ILS/DME avionics mix factor to ILS + ILS/DME avionics mix factor obtained from Table 5.2.

0

1000-10

Avionics Mix Factor Percent of IFR (Localizer + ILS w/wo DME) Equipped Fleet Function of Available Approach Aid and User Group

12

	Installed	Local.	izer Only		CTT		
	at	Percent	t Utilizing		Percent Utili	izing	
User Group	Runway	Localizer	Localizer/DME	Localizer	Localizer/DME	SII	ILS/DME
General Aviation	Yes	74.29	25.71	46.18	6.42	28.10	* 06.91
	No	100.00	1	52.60	1	47.40	1
Afr Tavi	Yes	44.26	55.75	13.11	[3.56]	(1.16	\$2.19
	No	100.00	1	16.67	1	83.33	1
Atr Carriar	Yes	0.00	100.00	0.00	[00.0]	0.0	100.00
	No	100.00	1	0.00	1	100.00	1
Willitary	Yes	44.26	55.75	13.11	[3.56]	(1.16	\$2.19
	No	100.00	1	16.67	1	83.33	1

L---- Tunways

Percents to be utilized in DME in lieu of outer marker computations at ILS

*

Percents to be utilized in computing safety benefits

23

at in

T.T. Suff

ATON A

Avionics Mix Factor Adjustor

User Category	AMFA
General Aviation	0.407
Air Taxi	0.626
Air Carrier	1.000
Military	0.626

The (ILS + DME) 15-year benefit/cost is determined for each user category using the ILS benefit and AMFA identified for each category. The results are then summed over all user categories.

5.2 Improved Safety

This benefit is predicated on the assumption that the additional information provided by the DME will periodically prevent an approach accident that would have otherwise occurred.

Since it was not possible to establish when a pilot utilized his DME on approach, it was necessary to use "opportunity to use DME on an instrument approach (AIA)" as the basis of the safety analysis. It was assumed that pilot habit patterns, within a given user category, in terms of DME use per AIA opportunity, would not markedly change in time.

The total number of Annual Instrument Approaches (AIA's) by type of approach (i.e., LOC, LOC/DME, ILS, ILS/DME) was determined for each year between 1968 and 1975 inclusive. This was accomplished by first applying the 1976 mix of approaches by facility type to the earlier years and adjusting the results to account for the commissioning dates of the equipment and the overall trend in total instrument approaches. Then an avionics mix for each user group was determined by interpolating between information available in 1961 (AOPA survey) and 1976 (provided by FAA/ASP). Applying the avionics mix factors to the approaches by runway equipment gave the resulting AIA's by year and user group. The number of approach accidents that occurred on ILS, ILS/DME, localizer, and/or localizer/DME runways during the eight years 1968-1975 was obtained from the NTSB Aircraft Accident Data Tapes. For the years 1974 and 1975, the avionics available on the aircraft (localizer, ILS, with/ without DME) was determined by examining the individual FAA aircraft records by N number. These records were not available for the years 1968-1973. For those years, the avionics equipment on board aircraft involved in approach accidents was estimated by applying the avionics mix factor for the particular user category and year.

These accident and opportunity statistics were combined to produce accident rates for localizer as well as ILS opportunities, both with and without DME for each user category. The difference between the with and without DME rates produced "maximum likelihood" DME-induced accident rates.

These accident data were then subjected to statistical significance analysis. Only the DME/ILS air taxi and general aviation and air carrier equipment/user categories satisfied this test. The resulting maximum likelihood accident rate reduction was then adjusted to yield the 50 percent confidence bound.

The 50 percent confidence bound value of DME-induced accident rate reduction for the combined air taxi and general aviation user categories was equal to 1.763 accidents eliminated per one million instrument approaches. The value for air carrier users was 6.132 accidents eliminated per one million approaches. This value was incorporated into the DME safety benefit analysis for those user groups when operating at ILS runways. All other user categories at ILS and all user categories at localizer were nulled out of the DME safety benefits due to lack of sufficient supportive statistics. These results are summarized in Table 5.4.

DME-Induced Accident Rate Reductions (ARR) (per Million AIA's)

User Category	DME with ILS	Localizer
Air Carrier	6.132	NA
Air Taxi	1.763	NA
General Aviation	1.763	NA
Military	NA	NA

The safety benefit on ILS-equipped runways attributable to the establishment of DME may now be derived:

SB = AIA x ARR x AMF x PVF x ACPA

where:

SB	= The DME-induced safety benefit discounted over 15 years
AIA	The recorded number of annual instrument approaches on the runway of interest
ARR	= DME-induced accident rate reductions
AMF (a)	= Avionics mix factor
PVF (b)	= Present value factor incorporating projected activity over 15 years with 10% discount
ACPA (c)	= Average cost per accident
Source:	(a) Table 5.2; (b) Table 5.5; (c) Table 5.6 (GA and AT) and Table 5.7 (AC)

 \bigcirc

Net Discount Factors for Benefit Estimation

12

AC AT CA AT AT AT CA AT AT AT		10% Discount	IFR	Growth Fac	tors	Net	Discount Fa	ctors
1.04 1.07 1.135 $.945$ $.973$ 1.032 1.08 1.14 1.270 $.892$ $.942$ 1.049 1.12 1.21 1.270 $.892$ $.942$ 1.045 1.16 1.28 1.540 $.792$ $.874$ 1.052 1.16 1.28 1.675 $.745$ $.838$ 1.040 1.20 1.35 1.675 $.745$ $.838$ 1.040 1.24 1.42 1.810 $.699$ $.801$ 1.021 1.28 1.49 1.945 $.657$ $.764$ $.998$ 1.28 1.49 1.945 $.657$ $.764$ $.998$ 1.28 1.49 1.945 $.657$ $.764$ $.998$ 1.28 1.49 1.945 $.657$ $.764$ $.998$ 1.32 1.672 $.2080$ $.616$ $.729$ $.971$ 1.32 1.63 2.215 $.577$ $.691$ $.939$ 1.40 1.77 2.485 $.504$ $.656$ $.907$ 1.48 1.84 2.620 $.472$ $.587$ $.836$ 1.48 1.84 2.755 $.441$ $.554$ $.799$ 1.56 1.98 2.990 $.410$ $.521$ $.709$ 1.56 1.980 $.9102$ $.9102$ $.921$ $.729$ 1.60 2.05 $.9102$ $.9102$ $.921$ $.729$ 1.60 2.05 $.921$ $.9109$ $.729$ 1.60 2.05 $.9$	Factor		AC	AT	GA	AC	AT	GA
1.08 1.14 1.270 $.892$ $.942$ 1.049 1.12 1.21 1.405 $.841$ $.909$ 1.055 1.16 1.28 1.540 $.792$ $.874$ 1.052 1.20 1.35 1.675 $.745$ $.838$ 1.040 1.24 1.42 1.810 $.699$ $.801$ 1.021 1.24 1.42 1.810 $.699$ $.801$ 1.021 1.28 1.49 1.945 $.657$ $.764$ $.998$ 1.28 1.49 1.945 $.657$ $.764$ $.991$ 1.28 1.49 1.945 $.657$ $.764$ $.993$ 1.28 1.49 1.945 $.577$ $.691$ $.971$ 1.36 1.63 2.215 $.577$ $.691$ $.939$ 1.44 1.77 2.350 $.540$ $.656$ $.971$ 1.44 1.77 2.485 $.504$ $.656$ $.937$ 1.44 1.77 2.485 $.504$ $.656$ $.937$ 1.48 1.84 2.620 $.472$ $.587$ $.837$ 1.52 1.91 2.755 $.441$ $.554$ $.799$ 1.56 1.98 2.890 $.410$ $.521$ $.729$ 1.60 2.05 $.3025$ $.3102$ $.490$ $.723$ 1.60 2.05 $.3025$ $.3102$ $.490$ $.723$ 1.60 2.05 $.3025$ $.3102$ $.490$ $.723$	606.		1.04	1.07	1.135	.945	.973	1.032
1.12 1.21 1.405 $.841$ $.909$ 1.052 1.16 1.28 1.540 $.792$ $.874$ 1.052 1.20 1.35 1.675 $.745$ $.838$ 1.040 1.24 1.42 1.810 $.699$ $.801$ 1.021 1.24 1.49 1.945 $.657$ $.764$ $.998$ 1.28 1.49 1.945 $.657$ $.764$ $.998$ 1.28 1.49 1.945 $.657$ $.764$ $.998$ 1.32 1.63 2.215 $.577$ $.691$ $.991$ 1.36 1.63 2.215 $.577$ $.691$ $.939$ 1.40 1.77 2.350 $.540$ $.656$ $.907$ 1.44 1.77 2.485 $.504$ $.650$ $.937$ 1.48 1.84 2.620 $.472$ $.587$ $.836$ 1.48 1.84 2.620 $.472$ $.587$ $.836$ 1.56 1.91 2.755 $.441$ $.554$ $.799$ 1.56 1.98 2.890 $.410$ $.521$ $.760$ 1.60 2.05 3.025 $.382$ $.490$ $.723$ 1.60 2.05 $.3025$ $.382$ $.490$ $.703$ 1.60 2.05 $.3025$ $.382$ $.490$ $.723$.826		1.08	1.14	1.270	.892	.942	1.049
1.16 1.28 1.540 $.792$ $.874$ 1.052 1.20 1.35 1.675 $.745$ $.838$ 1.040 1.24 1.42 1.810 $.699$ $.801$ 1.021 1.28 1.49 1.945 $.657$ $.764$ $.998$ 1.28 1.49 1.945 $.657$ $.764$ $.998$ 1.28 1.69 1.945 $.657$ $.764$ $.998$ 1.28 1.66 2.080 $.616$ $.729$ $.971$ 1.32 1.56 2.080 $.616$ $.729$ $.971$ 1.40 1.70 2.350 $.616$ $.729$ $.971$ 1.44 1.77 2.485 $.540$ $.656$ $.907$ 1.48 1.84 2.620 $.472$ $.631$ $.931$ 1.48 1.84 2.620 $.472$ $.587$ $.836$ 1.56 1.98 2.890 $.471$ $.554$ $.799$ 1.56 1.98 2.890 $.410$ $.521$ $.793$ 1.60 2.05 3.025 $.441$ $.524$ $.799$ 1.60 2.05 3.025 $.3102$ $.490$ $.723$ 1.60 2.05 3.025 $.3102$ $.91049$ $.14.05$.751		1.12	1.21	1.405	.841	606.	1.055
1.20 1.35 1.675 .745 .838 1.040 1.24 1.42 1.810 .699 .801 1.021 1.28 1.49 1.945 .657 .764 .998 1.28 1.49 1.945 .657 .764 .998 1.32 1.56 2.080 .616 .729 .971 1.34 1.56 2.015 .577 .691 .939 1.40 1.70 2.215 .577 .691 .939 1.40 1.77 2.350 .540 .656 .937 1.44 1.77 2.485 .504 .650 .937 1.48 1.84 2.620 .472 .587 .836 1.48 1.84 2.620 .441 .554 .799 1.52 1.91 2.755 .441 .554 .799 1.56 1.98 2.890 .410 .521 .709 1.60 2.05 3.025 .440 .521 .709 1.60 2.05 .3025	.683		1.16	1.28	1.540	.792	.874	1.052
1.24 1.42 1.810 $.699$ $.801$ 1.021 1.28 1.49 1.945 $.657$ $.764$ $.998$ 1.28 1.49 1.945 $.657$ $.7729$ $.971$ 1.32 1.56 2.080 $.616$ $.729$ $.971$ 1.36 1.63 2.2350 $.577$ $.691$ $.939$ 1.40 1.70 2.350 $.577$ $.691$ $.939$ 1.44 1.77 2.485 $.504$ $.656$ $.907$ 1.48 1.77 2.485 $.504$ $.620$ $.870$ 1.48 1.77 2.485 $.504$ $.620$ $.870$ 1.48 1.77 2.485 $.504$ $.620$ $.871$ 1.52 1.91 2.755 $.441$ $.554$ $.799$ 1.56 1.98 2.890 $.410$ $.521$ $.760$ 1.56 1.98 2.890 $.410$ $.521$ $.770$ 1.60 2.05 3.025 $.382$ $.490$ $.723$ 9.513 10.949 14.052 $.723$.621		1.20	1.35	1.675	.745	.838	1.040
1.28 1.49 1.945 .657 .764 .998 1.32 1.56 2.080 .616 .729 .971 1.36 1.63 2.215 .577 .691 .939 1.36 1.63 2.215 .577 .691 .939 1.40 1.70 2.350 .540 .656 .907 1.44 1.77 2.485 .504 .650 .870 1.44 1.77 2.485 .504 .650 .870 1.48 1.84 2.620 .472 .587 .836 1.52 1.91 2.755 .441 .554 .799 1.56 1.98 2.890 .410 .521 .760 1.60 2.05 3.025 .382 .490 .723 9.513 10.949 14.052 .733 .7490 .723	.564		1.24	1.42	1.810	669.	.801	1.021
1.32 1.56 2.080 $.616$ $.729$ $.971$ 1.36 1.63 2.215 $.577$ $.691$ $.939$ 1.40 1.70 2.350 $.540$ $.656$ $.907$ 1.44 1.77 2.485 $.504$ $.656$ $.907$ 1.48 1.77 2.485 $.504$ $.620$ $.870$ 1.48 1.77 2.485 $.504$ $.620$ $.870$ 1.48 1.77 2.485 $.504$ $.620$ $.870$ 1.52 1.91 2.755 $.471$ $.554$ $.799$ 1.56 1.98 2.890 $.410$ $.521$ $.770$ 1.60 2.05 3.025 $.382$ $.490$ $.723$ 1.60 2.05 3.025 $.382$ $.490$ $.723$ 9.513 10.949 14.052 $.723$.513		1.28	1.49	1.945	.657	.764	.998
1.36 1.63 2.215 $.577$ $.691$ $.939$ 1.40 1.70 2.350 $.540$ $.656$ $.907$ 1.44 1.77 2.485 $.504$ $.620$ $.870$ 1.48 1.77 2.485 $.504$ $.620$ $.870$ 1.48 1.77 2.485 $.504$ $.620$ $.870$ 1.48 1.84 2.620 $.472$ $.587$ $.836$ 1.52 1.91 2.755 $.441$ $.554$ $.799$ 1.56 1.98 2.890 $.410$ $.521$ $.760$ 1.60 2.05 3.025 $.382$ $.490$ $.723$ 9.513 10.949 14.052	.467		1.32	1.56	2.080	.616	.729	179.
1.40 1.70 2.350 .540 .656 .907 1.44 1.77 2.485 .504 .620 .870 1.44 1.77 2.485 .504 .620 .870 1.48 1.84 2.620 .472 .587 .836 1.52 1.91 2.755 .441 .554 .799 1.56 1.98 2.890 .410 .521 .760 1.60 2.05 3.025 .382 .490 .723 9.513 10.949 14.052 .733	.424		1.36	1.63	2.215	.577	169.	.939
1.44 1.77 2.485 .504 .620 .870 1.48 1.84 2.620 .472 .587 .836 1.52 1.91 2.755 .441 .554 .799 1.56 1.98 2.890 .410 .521 .760 1.56 1.98 2.890 .410 .521 .760 1.60 2.05 3.025 .382 .490 .723 9.513 10.949 14.052 .723	.386		1.40	1.70	2.350	.540	.656	106.
1.48 1.84 2.620 .472 .587 .836 1.52 1.91 2.755 .441 .554 .799 1.56 1.98 2.890 .410 .521 .760 1.56 1.98 2.890 .410 .521 .760 1.60 2.05 3.025 .382 .490 .723 9.513 10.949 14.052 .705 .705	.351		1.44	1.77	2.485	.504	.620	.870
1.52 1.91 2.755 .441 .554 .799 1.56 1.98 2.890 .410 .521 .760 1.60 2.05 3.025 .382 .490 .723 9.513 10.949 14.052	.319		1.48	1.84	2.620	.472	.587	.836
1.56 1.98 2.890 .410 .521 .760 1.60 2.05 3.025 .382 .490 .723 9.513 10.949 14.052	.290		1.52	1.91	2.755	144.	.554	661.
1.60 2.05 3.025 .382 .490 .723 9.513 10.949 14.052	.263		1.56	1.98	2.890	.410	.521	.760
9.513 10.949 14.052	.239		1.60	2.05	3.025	.382	.490	.723
	7.605					9.513	10.949	14.052

Military assumed equal to no-growth 15-year discount factor of 7.605

27

-

a trans

and Fright

Landing Accident Cost (\$000)

Aircraft Type	% Fleet	Fatalities	Serious Injury	Minor Injury	Aircraft	Investigation*	Total
4M	3.6	\$6,480	\$1,005	\$95	\$30,000	\$2,000	\$39,580
3W	7.6	4,290	665	60	20,000	2,000	27,015
N4	23.2	3,000	465	45	8,800	2,000	14,310
NE	29.5	2,490	385	35	6,000	1,000	9,910
2N	19.8	2,160	340	30	4,000	1,000	7,530
Turboprop	10.4	1,620	250	25	1,200	1,000	4,095
Piston	5.4	810	125	10	1,200	1,000	3,145
Helicopter	0.4	390	65	5	600	500	1,560
Air Carrier Average	100.0	2,631	409	42	7,400	1,342	11,824
Air Taxi	100.0	600	60	10	200	500	1,370
General Aviation	100.0	270	25	s	50	200	550
to a standard at							

28

10

Estimated

Source: FAA Report ASP-78-1, "Establishment Criteria for Category I MLS" (Draft)

Air Carrier Accident Costs and Benefits by Hub Size

Hub Size	Ratio to Average	Accident Cost	Benefit/AIA
Large	1.2773	15.103 x 10 ⁶	\$881.014
Medium	.9326	11.027 x 10 ⁶	643.246
Small	.7435	8.791 x 10 ⁶	512.812
Non	.5491	6.493 x 10 ⁶	378.761
Average	1.0000	11.824×10^{6}	689.738

The resulting DME-induced safety benefit for general aviation is as follows:

 $SB_{GA} @ ILS = AIA_{GA} x (1.763 x 10^{-6}) x 0.1930 x 14.052 x 0.55 x 10^{6}$

 $SB_{GA} @ ILS = AIA_{GA} \times 2.630

The resulting DME-induced safety benefit for air taxi operations is as follows:

 $SB_{AT} @ ILS = AIA_{AT} \times (1.763 \times 10^{-6}) \times 0.5219$ $\times 10.949 \times 1.37 \times 10^{6}$

SBAT @ ILS = AIAAT x \$13.802

The resulting DME-induced safety benefit for air carriers is as follows:

^{SB}_{AC @ ILS} = $AIA_{AC} \times (6.132 \times 10^{-6}) \times 1.00$

x 9.513 x 11.824 x 10⁶

$^{SB}_{AC} @ ILS = AIA_{AC} \times 689.738

The air carrier safety benefit is an average over all four hub categories. In order to properly distribute the benefit among the various hub sizes, this average was adjusted with the same technique used in FAA Report No. ASP-75-1, "Establishment Criteria for Category I Instrument Landing System (ILS)," Appendix B. This technique essentially uses the distribution of benefits per averted flight disruption by hub size for air carriers to weight the average safety benefit. Table 5.7 lists the estimated safety benefits per AIA for air carriers by hub size.

Accident cost by user category and number of injuries per landing accident by generic aircraft type data are presented in Tables 5.8 and 5.9, respectively, which supplement the landing accident cost estimates of Table 5.6. All of this information has been extracted from other FAA publications.

5.3 Reduced Localizer Minima

When published (either estimated or actual) DME with localizer minima are lower than the published localizer minima (typically due to the ability to provide a step down fix past an obstruction), then some previously (without DME) disrupted flights will be averted. The product of 15-year discounted cost per annual averted flight disruption and the number of averted flight disruptions in the base year is equivalent to the 15-year discounted reduced localizer minima benefit.

The number of base-year averted flight disruptions is sensitive to the number of AIA's, the avionics mix factor, the localizer minima, the localizer/DME minima, and the weather characteristics. The interactions of the last three parameters are illustrated in Figure 5.1. In this example, the percent of IFR weather when the runway is open increased from WOBA to WOBA + WOBB (See Figure 5.1). The increase in "usable" IFR weather is:

$$IFRW = 1 + \left[\frac{WOBB - WOBA}{WOBA}\right]$$

Accident Cost by User Category

Baseline Data

 \bigcirc

Serious Injury	\$ 45,000
Minor Injury	6,000
Passenger Death	300,000

Air Carrier	Aircraft	$(10^6)^a$	Number	%
Turbojet 4 Eng.	Widebody	30.0	96	3.6
3 Eng.	Widebody	20.0	204	7.6
4 Eng.	Narrow	8.8	623	23.2
3 Eng.	Narrow	6.0	790	29.5
2 Eng.	Narrow	4.0	531	19.8
Turboprop		1.2	280	10.4
Piston		1.2	145	5.4
Helicopter		.6	12	0.4
			2,681	

0-

Average	Air Carrier Aircraft Cost:	\$7.4 x 10 ⁶
Average	Air Taxi Aircraft Cost: ^a	.2 x 10 ⁶
Average Cost: ^a	General Aviation Aircraft	.05 x 10 ⁶

Source: a. "Establishment Criteria for Category I MLS," Draft Report FAA-ASP-78-1, 8/78, Table A-5

Certificated- Route Air Carrier	Average Revenue Passenger	Fatalities	Serious Injury	Minor Injury
4W	166.5	21.6	22.3	15.7
3W	110.7	14.3	14.8	10.4
4N	77.0	10.0	10.3	7.2
3N	63.7	8.3	8.5	6.0
2N	55.6	7.2	7.5	5.2
Turboprop	41.6	5.4	5.6	3.9
Piston	20.8	2.7	2.8	2.0
Helicopter	10.4	1.3	1.4	1.0
Air Taxi	8.0	2.0	1.3	2.0
General Aviation	2.1	0.9	0.6	0.9

Number of Injuries per Landing Aircraft by Generic Aircraft Type

Source: FAA Draft Report ASP-78-1, "Establishment Criteria for Category I MLS"

1

The resulting reduced localizer minima benefit is computed as follows for each user group:

RLMB = AIA x IFRW x AMF x BPAFD

where:

RLMB	=	reduced localizer minima 15 years discounted benefit for specified user group
AIA	=	annual instrument approaches to candidate runway
IFRW	=	increase in acceptable IFR weather factor applied to before DME conditions (derivation of this parameter is illustrated in Section 7.3)
AMF	=	avionics mix factor from Table 5.2
BPAFD	=	15-year discounted benefit per annual averted flight disruption from Table 5.10

TABLE 5.10

Benefit per Annual Averted Flight Disruption

User Group	Hub Size	15-Year Discounted Benefit
Air Carrier	Large Medium Small Non-Hub Average	\$42,692 31,173 24,851 18,355 33,425
Air Taxi	A11	3,964
General Aviation	A11	1,468
Military*	A11	795

*Assumed no activity growth

Source: Computations based on Appendix B of Reference 6, MLS Report, using aircraft operating costs shown in Table 5.11





5.4 Averted Missed Approach

This benefit is predicated on the fact that additional information provided by the DME, not required for a localizer approach, may be used by the pilot to reduce the number of missed approaches that would have occurred without that information. Thus, this benefit occurs only when the prevailing IFR weather minima lie above the localizer minima as shown in Figure 5.2.

Sugar



Figure 5.2 Regions of Reduced Localizer Minima and Averted Missed Approach Benefits

The approximation of reduced missed approach potential attributable to the addition of DME capability to either localizer or ILS approaches is displayed in Figure 5.3 and is sensitive to the prevailing Δ visibility and Δ ceiling, the published ceiling minima, and whether the DME is combined with localizer or ILS (where the Δ visibility and Δ ceiling is the difference between the prevailing weather and the published localizer/DME or ILS/DME minima as appropriate).

The approach used to develop Figure 5.3 was to establish a maximum value for the probability of averting a missed approach. This value corresponds to Δ ceiling, Δ visibility = 0, 0 and a published localizer/DME or ILS/DME (as appropriate) ceiling minima >1,000 feet and was set at 0.10 and 0.01 for localizer and ILS approaches, respectively (subsequently adjusted to 0.108 and 0.0108 to accommodate Δ ceilings and Δ visibilities greater than 1,250 feet and 2 nmi).



に見し

Figure 5.3 Probability of Averted Missed Approach Due to DME Opportunity

"

Reductions from the maximum probability values with increasing Δ ceiling and Δ visibility as well as reduced published ceiling minima were derived subjectively, based on achieving maximum sensitivity when close to low Δ ceiling and Δ visibility values, i.e., weather close to the published minimums.

The resulting probability of averted missed approach (PAMA) (obtained by using weighted values of that airport's weather conditions as described in Section 7.4) per AIA is then used to compute the averted missed approach benefit as follows:

AMAB = $\sum_{\text{User}} (\text{PAMA}) \times \frac{\text{GAD}}{40.05} \times \text{AMF} \times \text{PVF} \times \text{BPAMA} \times \text{AIA}$ Groups

where:

PAMA	=	probability of an averted missed approach
GAD	=	missed approach go-around distance in nautical miles
AMF	-	avionics mix factor (aircraft equipped with DME) taken from Table 5.2
PVF	-	15-year discount factor for appropriate user group taken from Table 5.5
BPAMA	-	dollar benefit for averted missed approach taken from Table 5.11
AIA	-	annual instrument approaches by user group

The relative magnitude of this benefit was small to the extent that the benefits associated with averted missed approaches under ILS/DME were dropped from the establishment and benefit/cost criteria.

User Group	Average Go-Around Distance (nmi)	Average ^a Go-Around Speed (knots)	Average Go-Around Time (hours)	Average ^b Operating Cost _(\$/hour)	Average Benefit per Averted Missed Approach (\$)
AC	40.05	200	0.20025	970	194.24
AT	40.05	140	0.2861	360	103.00
GA	40.05	110	0.3641	90	32.77
Mil	40.05	110	0.3641	90	32.77

Average Benefit of an Averted Missed Approach

Source: (a) FAA/Flight Standards (b) ASP-220

5.5 Expedited Departure

This benefit results when the average departure flight path length is shortened by use of the proposed DME. This average reduction in route length must be determined by the region and is applied only to aircraft that are equipped with DME. If no reduced departure route length is submitted by the region, this value will be set at zero and no benefit will result.

The resulting benefit relationship is shown below:

$$EDB = \sum_{\substack{\text{User} \\ \text{Group}}} AIA \times \Delta DFPL \times EDF$$

where:

- EDB = expedited departure benefit
- AIA = annual instrument approaches by user group
- ADFPL = reduction of departure flight path length, nmi, by user group
- EDF
- expedited departure factor by user group from Table 5.12. This factor includes avionics mix factor, operating costs, and 15-year discount factor. Derivation of this factor is provided in Section 7.5.

TABLE 5.12

Expedited Departure Benefits

User Group	Benefit/AIA/nmi Flight Path Reduction
Air Carrier	46.13
Air Taxi	15.70
General Aviation	2.95
Military	3.46

VI. CRITERIA IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Benefit-cost DME criteria were compared with Phase I numeric criteria to be published in Airway Planning Standard Number One. Criteria were applied to 535 runways having either a commissioned or planned full ILS and 181 commissioned or planned localizer/marker runways. The results, appearing in Table 6.1, document the "false alarm" rate (locations which pass Phase I but fail the Phase II benefit/ cost criteria with benefit/cost ratios less than 1.0) and the "non-identification" rate (locations which meet Phase I but fail Phase II criteria). In all, there were 281 qualifiers for DME at ILS and 35 qualifiers for DME at localizeronly runways using Phase II criteria.

TABLE 6.1

DME Criteria Assessment

	Number of Runways Examined	Phase II Qualifiers $(B/C \ge 1.0)$	False Alarms (Phase I \geq 1.0, B/C < 1.0)	Non-Identification (Phase I < 1.0, $B/C \ge 1.0$)
DME at ILS	535	281	2	7
DME at Localizer	181	35	25	3

Previous Airway Planning Standard criteria specified that an ILS airport recording 1,400 or more annual instrument approaches was a candidate for DME when lower localizer minima were authorized, fewer flight disruptions were anticipated, and IFR air traffic would be expedited.

In FY 1977, there were 282 airports having more than 1,400 AIA's. Of these, 12 airports did not have a full ILS while 15 already had DME installed. Using the previous Airway Planning Standard activity criteria, it was determined that up to 255 airports could qualify for DME, assuming compliance with the non-activity portions of the Planning Standard. Not included in this estimate are additional DME's that

were eligible for installation at airports having between 700 and 1,399 AIA's with special justification. However, based upon previous versus revised AIA activity criteria, it is concluded that the economic-based criteria are consistent with former numeric standards.

Airway Planning Standard Number One did not contain criteria for DME with localizer runway (other than in lieu of marker beacon). Thus, no comparison can be made with revised economic-based standards. The benefit/cost approach did, however, select 35 possible runways for localizer/DME as compared to 5 localizers now collocated with a DME.

VII. COMPUTATION OF DME BENEFIT/COST CRITERIA

The computations used to derive each of the five DME benefits, i.e.,

- (1) in lieu of an outer marker
- (2) improved safety
- (3) reduced localizer minima
- (4) averted missed approach
- (5) expedited departure

are described in the following paragraphs by means of illustrative examples. To facilitate an understanding of the procedures, extensive use is made of charts to reflect but not absolutely duplicate portions of the computer program used by FAA Headquarters to determine the benefit/cost (Phase II) for DME's that are identified by the FAA regions (using Phase I criteria described in Section III) as candidates for establishment with ILS or localizer.

The examples illustrated in this section use average costs and national average weather observations. Since, obviously, weather and costs can differ greatly among airports, their purpose is solely to illustrate the techniques used in the calculation of the benefits associated with each of the above categories. Benefit computations using airportspecific weather and cost data will be done by FAA Headquarters (ASP-220) as part of the Phase II candidate screening process.

7.1 Example of DME in Lieu of Outer Marker Benefit Computation

Step 1: Runway/airport input data.

Runway AIA's

Air Carrier								607
Air Taxi								27
General Aviation								327
Military								0

Total 961

15-	year dis	counted cost	t for	oute	r mar	ker	(OM)					\$500,000 ^a
ILS	without	OM 15-year	disco	unte	d cos	t							747,000 ^b
DME	15-year	discounted	cost	• •		• •	•	•	• •	•	•	•	167,248
ILS	15-year	discounted	benef	its:	Air	car	rie	r					862,207
					Air	tax	i.						37,015
					Gen	eral	av	iat	tio	n.			113,217
					Mil:	itar	у.	•		•	•	•	0

- (a) Illustrative cost only, reflecting substantially greater than nominal cost attributable to atypical installation problems such as over water.
- (b) Nominal cost from Reference 4 less \$25,000 nominal initial cost of OM.

Step 2: Determine the benefit of an ILS using a DME in lieu of an outer marker. This 15-year discounted benefit is the product of the ILS with an outer marker benefit and the avionics mix factor adjustor (obtained from Table 5.3, summed over all user groups as shown below):

Air carrier	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	\$862,207	x	1.00	=	\$862,207
Air taxi		•	•		•	•		\$ 37,015	x	.626	=	23,171
General Aviation.				•		•	•	\$113,217	x	.407	-	46,079
Military								eso-ob e	x	.626	-	0
									1			

ILS with DME in lieu of outer marker benefit = \$931,457

Step 3: Determine ILS with DME in lieu of an outer marker benefit/cost ratio.

This 15-year discounted benefit/cost ratio (ILOMBC) is defined by the quotient of the benefit determined in Step 2 and the sum of ILS without outer marker and DME costs, as shown below:

> User ILS Benefit x ILS/DME Avionics Mix Factor Adjustor ILS Cost + DME Cost

> > 43

Groups

Air Carrier:	$\frac{862,207 \times 1}{747,000 + 167,248}$	-	0.943
Air Taxi:	$\frac{37,015 \times .626}{747,000 + 167,248}$		0.026
General Aviation:	$\frac{113,217 \times .407}{747,000 + 167,248}$	-	0.050
	Total		1.019

By comparison, the example ILS without DME but with an outer marker has a benefit/cost ratio of:

ILS with Outer Marker	862,207 + 37,015 + 113,217	=	0.812
Benefit/Cost Ratio	747,000 + 500,000		0.011

Step 4: Outer marker cost threshold.

In the event it is not practical to determine the 15-year discounted cost of an outer marker (which, for example, may have to be sited over water), then the fallback position is to determine the outer marker cost threshold, above which it becomes advantageous to use a DME in lieu of an outer marker. This threshold cost may be determined through the use of the following relationship:

ILS Benefit=ILS/DME BenefitILS Cost + 0&M CostILS Cost + DME Cost

This relationship essentially causes the ILS and ILS/DME benefit/cost ratios to be equivalent. Solving for the outer marker threshold cost (OMTC) yields:

OMTC = (ILS Cost + DME Cost) x (ILS Benefit) - (ILS Cost) ILS/DME Benefit

In this example:

OMTC = $\frac{(747,000 + 167,248) \times (1,012,439)}{931,457} - (747,000)$

= \$246,203

If the outer marker 15-year discounted costs are determined to be this value or presumably higher, it then becomes advantageous to install the DME in lieu of outer marker.

7.2 Example of Safety Benefit Computation

This benefit computation is applicable only to airports with full ILS. All user groups except military enjoy a DME benefit.

Example: Reno, Nevada, Reno International Airport, Runway 16, Medium Hub

Step 1: Runway/airport input data.

User Group	AIA's on This Runway
Air Taxi	 44
General Aviation	 298
Air Carrier	 354

Step 2: Obtain DME safety benefit factors (derivation described in Section 5.2) from Table 7.1.

User Group												Ben	DME Safety Benefit Factor					
Air Taxi			•					•								\$	13.802/AIA	
General Aviation.												•				\$	2.630/AIA	1
Air Carrier																\$6	43.249/AIA	4

Step 3: Determine safety benefits as the product of annual instrument approaches and the safety benefit factor.

User Group											D	ME	Safety	Ben	efit	Factor
Air Taxi					•				•		44	x	13.802	=	\$	607.29
General Aviation.		•	•		•						298	x	2.630	=		783.66
Air Carrier	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	354	x	643.246	=	22	7,709.04
													Total		\$22	9,099.99

TABLE 7.1

DME at ILS Safety Benefit Factors

User Group	Safety Benefit Factor* (\$/AIA)
Air carrier - large hub	881.014
Air carrier - medium hub	643.246
Air carrier - small hub	512.812
Air carrier - non-hub	378.761
General aviation	2.630
Air taxi	13.802
Military	N/A**

* Derived in Section 5.2.

** Military accident statistics at civil airports are virtually non-existent. Therefore, no safety benefit due to the addition of DME could be ascertained for this category of user. Since military operations at civil airports are rare, it was believed that the impact of this lack of information would be extremely small. 7.3 Example of Reduced Localizer Minima Benefit Computation

Example: Carlsbad, California, Palomar Airport, Runway 24, Air Carrier User Group (largest aircraft category consistently using the runway)

Step 1: Runway/airport input data.

		Assumed User Group	Ceiling (feet)	Visibility (nmi)
Localize	er Minima:			
Airci	raft Category D	. AC	737	2
Estimate Localize	ed Minima for Proposed er/DME:			
Airci	raft Category D	. AC	400	3/4
				% Total Observation
Weather	Condition (National Avera	age):*		
(a)	(1,500 and/or 3) > C/V >	400-1		10.75
(b)	(400 and/or 1) > $C/V \ge$	200-1/2		1.61
(c)	(200 and/or 1/2) > C/V \geq	100-1/4		1 1 12
(d)	(100 and/or 1/4) > C/V			} <u> </u>
	Tota to 1	l less than of 500-3	r equal	13.48
03.44	Mille recently sample bac			

Runway AIA's:

τ	Jser G	ro	up	•												AIA's
	Air	C	arı	rie	er	•										11
Hub	Size.															Medium

* If benefit computation using airport-specific weather is desired, contact ASP-220.

The benefit associated with reducing the published localizer minima through the addition of a DME is related to the number of AIA's, the magnitude of the minima reduction made possible by the DME, and the distribution of IFR weather conditions at the airport of interest. These weather conditions are described as percent of total observations between ceiling/visibility limits of 1500-3 and 400-1; 400-1 and 200-1/2; 200-1/2 and 100-1/4; and less than 100-1/4. In this example, as shown in Step 1, these values are 10.75, 1.61, and 1.12 percent, respectively.

If the localizer and the localizer/DME minima happen to coincide with the ceiling/visibility values used as limits to describe the weather conditions, i.e., 1500-3, 400-1, 200-1/2, and/or 100-1/4, the percent increase in IFR operations (assumed to be directly related to percent observations) attributable to the addition of a DME could be easily determined. However, for the general case, when those minima are different from the weather condition limits, a linear interpolation procedure can be used.

Step 2: Determine percent increase in total IFR weather conditions due to lower minima (see Table 7.2).

 $PC IFR = \frac{(PC LOC MIN) - (PC LOC/DME)}{(PC 1500-3) - (PC LOC MIN)}$

where:

PC IFR	=	percent increase in acceptable IFR weather
PC LOC MIN	=	percent observations less than or equal to localizer minima (Table 7.2)
PC LOC/DME	=	percent observations less than or equal to localizer/DME minima (Table 7.2)
PC 1500-3	=	percent observations less than or equal to 1500-3 (Table 7.2)
PC IFR	=	$\frac{6.59 - 2.37}{13.48 - 6.59} = \frac{4.22}{6.89}$
	=	.612 (61.2%)

TABLE 7.2

Percentage Distributions of Weather Observations Equal to or Less Than Selected Ceilings and/or Visibilities (National Average)

	Visibility (Miles)												
Ceiling (Feet)	1/2 %	3/4	<u> </u>	$\frac{1-1/2}{\%}$	3%								
200	1.12	1.52	2.01	3.13	7.10								
300	1.48	1.79	2.21	3.25	7.13								
400	2.14	2.37	2.73	3.64	7.29								
500	2.88	3.08	3.38	4.20	7.60								
600	3.67	3.84	4.09	4.81	7.99								
700	4.57	4.72	4.95	5.60	8.57								
800	5.47	5.61	5.81	6.40	9.15								
1,000	7.24	7.36	7.54	8.05	10.48								
1,500	10.80	10.91	11.05	11.45	13.48								

Step 3: Determine percent AIA's using localizer/DME.

Identify, from Table 5.2, percent of air carrier (Category D aircraft) AIA's at non-ILS airport (Palomar) that would use localizer/DME approach (balance assumed to use localizer approach).

Step 4: Determine additional AIA's resulting from DME installation.

AIA's is the product of current AIA's (from Step 1), percent increase in acceptable IFR weather, i.e., > localizer/ DME minima (from Step 2), and the LOC/DME utilization factor from Step 3.

49

The second and the second and and all

AIA's x PC IFR x L/D UF = \triangle AIA

$$11 \times 0.612 \times 1.0 = 6.73$$

Step 5: Determine 15-year discounted benefit.

Benefit is equal to the product of the number of additional AIA's from Step 4 (assumed to be equal to the number of annual averted flight disruptions) and the 15-year discounted benefit per averted flight disruption from Table 5.10.

 $6.73 \times \$31,173 = \$209,857$

To determine the total benefit for lower minima over all user groups, substitute the applicable use factor from Table 5.2, the AIA's from Step 1, and the benefits per averted flight disruption from Table 5.10 into Steps 3 to 5 above for each other user group and sum the benefits calculated for each user group.

- 7.4 Example of DME with Localizer Averted Missed Approach Benefit
- Example: Reno, Nevada, Reno International Airport, Runway 34, Air Carrier User Group (largest aircraft category consistently using runway)
- Step 1: Runway/airport input data.

	Assumed User Group	Ceiling (feet)	Visibility (nmi)
Localizer Minima:			
Aircraft Category D	AC	1,388	2.00
Localizer/DME Minima:			
Aircraft Category D	AC	928	2.00

Weather	Condition (National Average):*	% Total Observations
(A)	$(1,500 \text{ and/or } 3) > C/V \ge 400-1 \dots$	10.75
(B)	(400 and/or 1) > $C/V \ge 200-1/2 \dots$	1.61
(C)	$(200 \text{ and/or } 1/2) > C/V \ge 100-1/4$) 1.12
(d)	(100 and/or 1/4) > C/V	}
	Total less than or equal to 1500-3	13.48

Runway AIA's: (by user group):

User Group:	AIA's
General Aviation	128
Air Taxi	19
Air Carrier	152
Military	10

*If benefit computation using airport-specific weather is desired, contact ASP-220.

Step 2: Determine applicable weather conditions.

These conditions lie between the localizer minima and the nominal VFR condition at 1500-3 and, for this example, are approximated by Conditions A-I, A-II, and A-III. See Figure 7.2.

Step 3: Determine probability of occurrence for each weather condition.

From Step 1, the probability of weather Condition A is 0.1075 (10.75 percent). The weather weighting factors of Figure 7.1 are applied to this value, producing the appropriate weather probability of occurrence for each weather condition:

Weather	Probability of Occurrence Entire		Weighting		Probability of
Condition	Condition A	x	Factor	х	Occurrence
A-I	0.1075	x	0.188	=	0.02096
A-II	0.1075	x	0.0372	=	0.003999
A-III	0.1075	x	0.2790	=	0.029992

Step 4: Determine difference between applicable weather conditions and the localizer/DME minima, i.e., ΔC and ΔV .

Localizer/DME minima of 928-2 is obtained from Step 1. Ceiling/visibility values representing the applicable weather conditions are obtained from Figure 7.2.

Weather Condition	$\left\{ \frac{-\text{Localizer}}{\text{DME Minima}} \right\}$	+ •	Representative Ceiling-Visibility	$\Delta C / \Delta V$
A-I	(-C = 928)	+	(C = 1,500)	574-1/4
	(-V = 2)	+	(V = 2-1/4)	
A-II	(-C = 928)	+	(C = 1, 250)	322-1/4
	(-V = 2	+	(V = 2-1/4)	
A-III	(-C = 928)	+	(C = 1, 250)	322-1
	(-V = 2)	+	(V = 3)	









54

a Prissing

Step 5: Determine probability of an averted missed approach when the prevailing weather conditions are within the range of each applicable weather condition.

Use Figure 7.3 with the appropriate $\Delta V/\Delta C$ from Step 4 and the localizer/DME ceiling of 928 feet from Step 1.

Weather Condition	Probability of Averted Missed Approach During Stipulated Weather Condition
A-I	0.032
A-II	0.045
A-III	0.026

Step 6: Determine probability of an averted missed approach.

This step is accomplished by taking the sum of the products of the probability of an averted missed approach under specified weather conditions (Step 5) and the probability of that weather condition occurring (Step 3), across all applicable weather conditions:

	Probability of Averted Missed Approach under Specified		Probability of Specified Weather		Probability of
Weather	Weather		Condition		Missed Approach
Condition	Condition	x	Occurring	=	per AIA
A-I	0.032	x	0.020296	=	0.00064947
A-II	0.045	x	0.003999	-	0.00017995
A-III	0.026	x	0.029992	=	0.00077979
			То	tal	0.0016092

55

()



the state

Step 7: Determine the 15-year discounted averted missed approach benefit at Reno International, Runway 34 for air carriers.

This benefit is the product of the probability of an averted missed approach per AIA (Step 6), the number of air carrier AIA's (Step 1), percent of instrumented fleet equipped with DME from Table 5.2, the appropriate dollar benefit per averted missed approach taken from Table 5.11, and the appropriate 15-year discount factor taken from Table 5.5, adjusted by the go-around distance obtained from Step 1.

 $0.0016092 \times 152 \times 1.00 \times 194.24 \times 9.513 \times \frac{40.05^{a}}{40.05^{b}} = 451.97

a. Obtained from Step 1.

b. Constant (average go-around distance).

As in the calculation of reduced localizer minima benefits (Section 7.3), this process would be repeated using the probability of an averted missed approach from Step 6 and the appropriate AIA's (Step 1), avionics mix factor (Table 5.2), dollar benefit per averted missed approach (Table 5.11), and discount factor (Table 5.5) for each other user group summed to produce the total 15-year discounted averted missed approach benefit.

7.5 Example of Expedited Departure Benefit Computation

Example: San Jose, California, San Jose Municipal Airport, Runway 30L, General Aviation User Group

Step 1: Runway/airport input data.

Runway AIA's:

User Group:																	AIA's
Air Carrier	•	•	•	•	•	•	•			•	•	•	•		•	•	2,449
Air Taxi	•	•		•	•	•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•			422
General Aviation.	•		•	•	•				•		•		•	•	•	•	2,276
Military																	9

Reduction in departure flight path due to addition of DMEsupported departure procedures:

Assumed as an example = 2 nmi

Step 2:

Using the appropriate user group expedited departure value from Table 5.12, form the product with this value and the user group runway AIA's. This product yields the benefit dollar per nautical mile saved in the reduced departure flight path. Final multiplication of this quantity with the departure path reduction yields the total 15-year discounted benefit. Hence,

Air Carrier:	46.13	x	2,449 x 2	2 =	= \$225,945
Air Taxi:	15.70	x	442 x 2	2 =	= 13,251
General Aviation:	2.95	x	2,276 x 2	2 =	= 13,428
Military:	3.46	x	9 x 2	2 :	= 62
			Total		= \$252,686

The values in Table 5.12 are determined as follows: Aircraft operating costs from ASP-220 are given as \$970/block hour, \$360/block hour, and \$90/block hour for air carrier, air taxi, and general aviation, respectively. Under the assumption that military and general aviation are to be equivalent implies a military aircraft operating cost of \$90/block hour. Another component of the expedited departure is aircraft speed in the departure phase. These speeds were estimated to be (average values) 200 knots for air carrier, 140 knots for air taxi, and 110 knots for general aviation. These values were derived in concurrence with the Flight Standards Service. Again, under the study ground rules, the military aircraft speed is also taken as 110 knots (equivalent to gen-eral aviation). The avionics mix factor relating to "Localizer only" of Table 5.2 is utilized since the DME-supported departure path is utilized for all DME-equipped aircraft regardless of whether or not it has both LOC and glide slope. The avionics mix factor together with the other components are combined in the following manner to derive the values displayed in Table 5.12.

Table
5.12Aircraft Operating Cost x Discount Factor x Avionics Mix
Aircraft SpeedValueAircraft Speed

Hence,

Air Carrier:
$$\frac{970 \times 9.513 \times 1}{200} = 46.13$$
Air Taxi: $\frac{360 \times 10.949 \times 0.5575}{140} = 15.70$

General Aviation: $\frac{90 \times 14.052 \times 0.2571}{110} = 2.95$

Military: $\frac{90 \times 7.605 \times 0.5575}{110} = 3.46$

These values are benefit dollars per nautical mile flight path reduction per AIA. An additional assumption is that for each AIA there is an instrument departure. Therefore, the recorded AIA's are a good measure of the number of instrument departures to be expected at a particular airport.

7.6 Benefit/Cost Ratio

7.6.1 Without Using DME in Lieu of an Outer Marker

Step 1: The benefits computed for improved safety, reduced localizer minima, averted missed approach, and expedited departure as described in Sections 7.2 to 7.5 should be summed over all appropriate user groups, resulting in the total 15-year discounted benefit expected should a DME be established with either an ILS or localizer approach aid (as appropriate for the candidate runway).

Step 2: Compute 15-year discounted DME cost from the region inputs (illustrative example different from nominal values of Section IV). Compute 15-year discounted present value cost.

DME PVC = Equipment Cost + Installation Cost + (7.605) Annual O&M Cost

- = \$48,400 + \$16,000 + (7.605)(\$15,000)
- = \$178,475

Step 3: Compute the benefit/cost ratio by dividing the total benefits of Step 1 by the costs of Step 2.

7.6.2 When DME Is Used in Lieu of an Outer Marker with an ILS

Step 1: Determine the combined ILS plus DME 15-year discounted benefits.

Add the benefit derived in Step 1 of Section 7.6.1 to the ILS/DME benefit determined in Step 2 of Section 7.1.

Step 2: Determine the 15-year discounted benefit/cost ratio for the combined ILS-DME system.

Take the total benefits determined in Step 1 and divide that value by the combined ILS (without outer marker) plus DME cost, obtained from Step 1 of Section 7.1.

REFERENCES

- "Airway Planning Standard Number One Terminal Air Navigation Facilities and Air Traffic Control Services," Order 7031.2B, dated September 20, 1974.
- 2. "United States Standard for Terminal Procedures," (TERPS Third Edition), July 1976, FAA.
- 3. "FAA Air Traffic Activity, Calendar Year 1976," dated December 31, 1976.
- "Establishment Criteria for Category I Instrument Landing System (ILS)," Report No. ASP-75-1, dated December 1975.
- 5. "Airman's Information Manual," 1975.
- Draft copy of "Establishment Criteria for Category I Microwave Landing Systems (MLS)," Report No. FAA-ASP-78-1, dated August 1978.
- "Airport Activity Statistics of Certificated Route Air Carriers," 12 Months Ended December 31, 1976, FAA/CAB.
- 8. 1976 FAA Airport Directory Tapes.
- "Ceiling-Visibility Climatological Study and Systems Enhancement Factors," Contract No. DOT-FA75WAI-547, dated June 1975.
- "Jeppessen Approach Charts," Revision 20, Vol. 4, Jeppessen Sanderson, Inc., July 1977.
- 11. "Flight Procedures and Airspace," Order 8260.19, Change 13, dated September 1975.

☆ U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1979 - 0- 285-667/6665

